



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL
OF
SEMITIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES
(CONTINUING HEBRAICA)

VOLUME XXVII

JANUARY, 1911

NUMBER 2

THE COMPOSITION OF THE ELIHU SPEECHES¹
(JOB, CHAPS. 32-37)

BY HELEN HAWLEY NICHOLS

HISTORY OF THE INTERPRETATION OF THE ELIHU SPEECHES

The speeches with which this discussion is concerned constitute chaps. 32-37 of the Book of Job. In agreement with the verdict of the majority of modern scholars and for reasons to be considered later, this discussion assumes that the Elihu Speeches are not an integral and original part of the poem. But their history and that of their interpretation are inevitably bound up with those of the Book of Job. Though Job without the Elihu Speeches would be artistically more perfect, the Elihu Speeches separated from the poem could have no significance.

Scholars previous to the nineteenth century did not question the genuineness of the speeches. Stuhlmann² in 1804 was the first to suggest that they formed a later addition to the poem. Yet the judgment passed upon Elihu by earlier critics is still of interest for the interpretation of his contribution.

The rabbis devote far less attention to him in the Talmud than his own claims would seem to have warranted. In the Babylonian

¹A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Bryn Mawr College in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

² *Hiob*, 1804.

Talmud¹ he is reckoned with the seven prophets of the Gentiles: Balaam, his father, Job, Eliphaz, Bildad, Zophar, and Elihu. It was later maintained, however, that all these prophets were Israelites, who prophesied primarily concerning the Gentiles. A discussion once arose between R. Akiba,² who believed Elihu was Balaam, and R. Eleazar, who contended that he must represent Isaac because of his name Barachel. With surprising insight Rabbi Judah³ maintained that Job's words were in praise of God, more than Elihu's.

In the Testament of Job⁴—a Greek apocryphal form of the story—Elihu appears as a Satanic beast, and when the friends are pardoned Elihu does not receive forgiveness.

The early Christian Fathers were by no means admirers of Elihu. Jerome in his commentary on Job⁵ agreed with the opinion of the Talmudist that Elihu represented Balaam and was therefore a false prophet, while Gregory the Great⁶ believed that Elihu had right understanding of the matter but his words were proud and arrogant. The heretical Theodore of Mopsuestia,⁷ whose opinions concerning Job were cited as evidence against him, found Elihu's words if possible more offensive than those of the friends.

Jewish criticism of a later period seems decidedly more favorable to Elihu. Ibn Esra⁸ expresses the opinion, in a commentary which dates from about 1140, that the true solution of the problem is to be found in Elihu's words. Job is there taught by the consideration of nature's mysteries not to seek full understanding of God's justice and the friends are reproved for their insufficient conception of God's providence.

The remarkable theory was advocated by Lightfoot⁹ that Elihu was the real author of the poem. Michaelis¹⁰ and Schultens¹¹ looked

¹ *Baba Bathra*, 15b.

² *Jer. Talmud*, *Sotah*, V, 20d.

³ *Ex. R.* 34:1; *Jew. Enc.*, art. "Job."

⁴ See "Testament of Job" in *Jew. Enc.*, VII.

⁵ *Praefatio in Job*, IX.

⁶ *Expositio moralis in beatum Iob* (Bibliotheca Patrum Latina 75, 76).

⁷ *Mansi's Councils*, IX, col. 200 f.

⁸ *Abraham Ibn Esra's Hiobkommentar*, Julius Galliner (Dissertation, 1901).

⁹ *Chronol. V. T.*, p. 25 (quoted by Michaelis).

¹⁰ *Notae Ueberiores in librum Jobi* (1720).

¹¹ *Liber Jobi* (1737).

upon him with favor, as did Calvin,¹ and to Bishop Lowth² Elihu's gentleness appeared in beautiful contrast to the harshness of Job's other censors. In 1750 an Englishman named Hodges³ devoted an entire treatise to an attempt to show that Elihu was an antitype of Christ and therefore his words were similar to the Yahweh Speeches.

After centuries of alternately over-harsh or over-commendatory estimates of his worth, it remained for the nineteenth century to question his place in the book. Though Stuhlmann believed the poem itself a pre-Mosaic work, he assigned to the speeches of Elihu a post-exilic date. His chief arguments against their genuineness were that they rendered the Yahweh Speeches superfluous and that they were inferior in style to the remainder of the book.

From that time until the present the discussion of the Elihu Speeches has been largely concerned with the question of their genuineness. It will be simpler to give a list of the important names identified with either decision and to discuss afterward special treatments of the subject. In favor of their genuineness are: Jahn,⁴ Staëudlein,⁵ Berthold,⁶ Gesenius,⁷ Schaerer,⁸ Rosenmueller,⁹ Umbreit,¹⁰ Bruno Bauer,¹¹ Vaihinger,¹² Stickel,¹³ Haevernick,¹⁴ Hahn,¹⁵ Schlottmann,¹⁶ Hengstenberg,¹⁷ Deutsch,¹⁸ Bunsen,¹⁹ Kamphausen,²⁰ Green,²¹

¹ *Conciones* (1563). Translated by Arthur Golding, 1593.

² *De Sacra Poesi Hebraeorum* (1753).

³ *Elihu, or an Enquiry into the Principal Scope and Design of the Book of Job* (1750).

⁴ *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, II.

⁵ *Beiträge zur Philosophie und Geschichte der Sittenlehre*, II.

⁶ *Einleitung in die Schriften des Alten Testaments*, V (1815).

⁷ *Geschichte der hebräischen Sprache*.

⁸ *Das Buch Hiob* (1818).

⁹ *Scholia in Vet. Test.* (1824).

¹⁰ *Das Buch Hiob* (1832).

¹¹ *Die Religion des Alten Testaments*, II.

¹² *Das Buch Hiob* (1842).

¹³ *Das Buch Hiob* (1842).

¹⁴ *Handbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung ins Alte Testament*, 3 Theil (1849).

¹⁵ *Commentar über das Buch Hiob* (1850).

¹⁶ *Das Buch Hiob* (1851).

¹⁷ *Das Buch Hiob* (1870).

¹⁸ *De Elihui Sermonum Origine atque Auctore* (Dissertation, 1873).

¹⁹ *Theol. Studien und Kritiken* (1863), S. 1810.

²⁰ Bleek, *Einl.*, S. 661. (These two are quoted by Budde in his *Commentar*, S. xvii.)

²¹ *Argument of Job Unfolded* (1873).

Boelicke,¹ Godet,² Cox,³ Briggs,⁴ Genung,⁵ Wildeboer,⁶ Cornill,⁷ Budde,⁸ Posselt.⁹ It should be mentioned that Bunsen and Kamp-hausen suggest that the speeches were added later by the original poet to avoid misunderstanding of the poem.

Against the genuineness of the speeches range themselves in long array after Stuhlmann: Eichhorn,¹⁰ Bernstein,¹¹ Vatke,¹² Ewald,¹³ Hirzel,¹⁴ Knobel,¹⁵ Heiligstedt,¹⁶ Magnus,¹⁷ Renan,¹⁸ Simson,¹⁹ Schra-der,²⁰ Dillmann,²¹ Merx,²² Hitzig,²³ Delitzsch,²⁴ Studer,²⁵ Davidson,²⁶ Wright,²⁷ Kleinert,²⁸ Holtzmann,²⁹ Cheyne,³⁰ Reuss,³¹ Grill,³² Hoff-mann,³³ Driver,³⁴ Koenig,³⁵ Bickell,³⁶ Margoliouth,³⁷ Siegfried,³⁸

¹ *Die Elihureden* (Dissertation, 1879).

² *Etudes bibliques* (transl. by Lyttelton, 1875).

³ *A commentary on the Book of Job* (1885).

⁴ *Pres. Review* (1885), p. 353.

⁵ *The Epic of the Inner life* (1891).

⁶ *Die letterkunde des Ouden Verbonds* (1893) (German transl. by Risch, 1895).

⁷ *Introduction to the Can. Bks. of the O.T.* (English transl. by Box, 1907).

⁸ *Beiträge zur Kritik des Buches Hiob* (1876); *Das Buch Hiob* (1896).

⁹ *Der Verfasser der Eliu-Reden* (1909).

¹⁰ *Einleitung ins A.T.*, V (1824).

¹¹ *Keil's und Tzschirner's Analekten*, III.

¹² *Biblische Theologie*, I (1835).

¹³ *Die poetischen Bücher des A.T.* 3 Theil (1836).

¹⁴ *Hiob* (1839).

¹⁵ *De Carminis Jobi argumento* (1835).

¹⁶ *Commentarius in Jobum* (1842).

¹⁷ *Commentar zum Hiob* (1851).

¹⁸ *Le Livre de Job* (1860).

¹⁹ *Zur Kritik des Buches Hiob* (1861).

²⁰ (de Wette-Schrader) *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung* (1869).

²¹ *Hiob* (1869), 4th ed., 1891.

²² *Das Gedicht von Hiob* (1871).

²³ *Das Buch Hiob* (1874).

²⁴ *Das Buch Hiob* (1876).

²⁵ *Das Buch Hiob* (1881).

²⁶ "The Book of Job" in the *Cambridge Bible* (1884).

²⁷ *The Book of Job* (1883).

²⁸ "Das spezifisch Hebräische im Buche Hiob," in *Theol. St. Kr.* (1886), S. 26 f.

²⁹ In Stade's *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, II, S. 348 (1888).

³⁰ *Job and Solomon* (1887).

³¹ *Hiob* (1888).

³² *Zur Kritik der Komposition des Buches Hiob* (1890).

³³ *Hiob* (1891).

³⁴ *Introduction to the Literature of the O.T.* (1891).

³⁵ *Einleitung ins A.T.* (1893).

³⁶ *Das Buch Hiob* (1894).

³⁷ Art. "Job" in *Smith's Bible Dict.* (1893).

³⁸ "The Book of Job" in *Polychrome Bible* (1893).

Kuenen,¹ Baethgen,² Laue,³ Strack,⁴ Meinhold,⁵ Marti,⁶ Duhm,⁷ Davison,⁸ Friedrich Delitzsch,⁹ Ley,¹⁰ Peake.¹¹

Those who have defended Elihu in the critical debate have usually found in his words the positive solution of the problem, which the poem without them fails to give, and a preparation for the Theophany. But even among some modern scholars an exactly opposite view has been held. Herder,¹² who called Elihu "ein lauter Schatten," may be considered an early exponent of it. Hahn and Umbreit uphold a similar theory, and more recently in this country Briggs and Genung. According to this view Elihu sums up the argument of the friends in all its essential weakness to show that the mystery is unsolvable by human wisdom and thus to prepare the reader for the great revelation of Yahweh in the chapters which follow. The author has intentionally characterized Elihu as a bombastic and over-confident youth in order to emphasize the inadequacy of his wisdom. Genung finds an exquisite dramatic fitness and grim irony in the claim which Elihu makes and his later humiliation.

We must agree with Budde that this is of all explanations the most improbable. This kind of subtle irony would be more natural to a modern mind than to a Hebrew poet. Moreover, the theory shows a singular lack of appreciation for the sincerity and real worth of Elihu's words. They are earnest and earnestly meant by their author.

After Stuhlmann, the next severe attacks against the genuineness of the Elihu Speeches were made by Ewald in 1836 and Hirzel in 1839. They urged the peculiarities of the language of Elihu as indubitable evidence against him. Stickel answered this charge

¹ *Historisch-kritische Einleitung*, 3 Theil (transl. by Müller, 1894).

² Kautzsch's *Die heilige Schriften des A.T.* (1896).

³ *Die Komposition des Buches Hiob* (Dissertation, 1895).

⁴ *Einleitung ins A.T.* (1895).

⁵ "Das Problem des Buches Hiob," in *Neue Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie* (1892), Band I, S. 63.

⁶ *Geschichte der israelitischen Religion*, III, S. 262 (1897).

⁷ *Hiob* (1897).

⁸ Art. "Job" in *Hastings' Bib. Dic.*, II (1899).

⁹ *Das Buch Hiob* (1902).

¹⁰ *Das Buch Hiob* (1903).

¹¹ "Job," *Century Bible* (1905).

¹² *Vom Geist der Ebräischen Poesie*, I (1782).

in 1842 by a detailed study of the linguistic evidence and came to the conclusion that it was not sufficient to condemn the speeches.

In 1873 Emmanuel Deutsch published a dissertation which reviewed the controversy up to that date. He found a convincing argument for the speeches in the fact that Elihu takes a higher ground than the friends and supplies the deficiencies of the earlier discussion. But his argument is rather an apology for Elihu than a scholarly defense of his place in the poem.

A far more effective defense was made by Budde in 1876. Following Stickel's plan, he made a careful comparison of the diction of chaps. 32-37 with that of the poem and expressed the conviction "dass die Echtheit der Elihu-Reden ihrem sprachlichen Charakter gegenüber vollkommen möglich bleibt." His thorough study established the fact that the linguistic argument must be strongly supported by other arguments to render an adverse judgment decisive.

Budde was followed by Boelicke in a dissertation on the speeches, which maintained their genuineness.

Among recent defenders of Elihu may be mentioned Cornill and Wildeboer. Though admitting striking contrasts between these chapters and the rest of the book, they yet find in them the profound and positive solution of the problem, which they believe the poet must have given. They, with Budde, suggest that the formal incompleteness of the latter half of the dialogue may be due to lack of revision by the author, a fact which might also account for the inferior style of the Elihu chapters.

In his commentary on Job, Budde again took up the defense; this time less from the standpoint of language than from that of interpretation. He admits that the speeches as a whole make a somewhat unfavorable impression on him but he believes that the removal of numerous glosses will do much to alter this impression. The aim of the poet, as Budde interprets it, is to reveal to Job his sin of hidden spiritual pride and to bring him to penitence. Only after this experience could he be pardoned and restored. It is Elihu's mission to bring him to the true understanding of his trial, and the chapters are therefore indispensable in the scheme of the poem. Cornill also holds this interpretation.

The most recent special treatment of the speeches is that of

Wenzel Posselt. The arguments against their genuineness are considered with thoroughness and fairness but no convincing evidence is offered in their defense.

In the following general summary of the arguments employed by Elihu's defenders, those are chiefly considered which assume the positive worth of his contribution. Many of the same arguments are, however, employed with either interpretation.

GENUINENESS OF THE ELIHU SPEECHES

Content.—1. Aside from the speeches the poet brings no positive answer to Job's problem. The Yahweh Speeches merely bring the hero to submission.

2. Elihu offers a positive teaching which is in advance of that of the friends and at the very summit of Old Testament thought.

a) Job may not because of his own trials forget the divine justice and wisdom which are the order of the universe.

b) Pain and suffering are educative—a means of blessing in God's hands and a proof of his love.

c) Suffering is to bring to light hidden sin, and to destroy it.

3. The solution could not be put into the mouth of Yahweh, who would thus descend to the level of human debate, but must be offered by another speaker. Elihu's somewhat exalted view of himself and his extreme zeal are due to youthful enthusiasm.

Relation to the poem.—1. The speeches prepare for the Theophany by the description of the storm.

2. Elihu is not mentioned in the Prologue because he represents an impartial bystander, who enters the discussion later than the others. A more convincing suggestion is that the poet took the three friends from tradition, but invented the figure of Elihu. This suggestion might explain also the different character of his name.

3. Elihu is not mentioned in the Epilogue because his words are taken up and tacitly justified in the speeches of Yahweh.

4. Job does not answer because Elihu has brought conviction. The negative interpretation would explain his silence on the ground that Elihu has said nothing new.

5. The prose introduction is necessary in order to explain why Elihu has not earlier entered the discussion.

6. A later interpolator would, in general, have taken more pains to disguise his work and to liken it in all details to that of the original author.

Style.—1. The greater number of Aramaisms in Elihu's speech is an artistic touch of the poet to indicate the speaker's Aramaic origin.

2. The tedium and inferiority of his style are to be attributed to the unfinished character of the latter portion of the poem. They are also, in part, due to glosses.

3. The mention of Job's name is necessary to distinguish between him and the friends in address.

4. The use of quotations from the earlier dialogue is to lend emphasis to the speaker's arguments.

The above summary does not pretend to include all the arguments which have been brought forward in defense of the Elihu Speeches. Not all the arguments mentioned are of equal weight, nor have all been equally emphasized. Most stress has legitimately been laid by serious scholars on the relation of the speeches to the development of the thought of the poem.

Without replying definitely to each of the points suggested we shall attempt to restate what seem to us the conclusive reasons for believing that the Elihu Speeches and Job had not a common author. No originality can be claimed for such a statement, for the evidence has been collected and presented by a host of scholars. For the same reason it would be futile to attempt to trace each suggestion to its author.

It seems a better arrangement in this case to reverse the order of the discussion and consider first those characteristics of relationship and style which lead most naturally to questions concerning the Elihu Speeches.

Relation to the poem.—1. Elihu is not mentioned in the Prologue or Epilogue. The former omission might be explained naturally enough by his later entrance, but the latter is not so easily disposed of. Even though Yahweh's words may implicitly sanction Elihu's, the Epilogue, which so definitely metes out reward and punishment, should have awarded Elihu his due.

2. The brief subscription after chap. 31, "The words of Job are ended," is somewhat surprising if written by the author of the poem, for Job speaks again in chap. 42. It appears suspiciously like the addition of a later hand.

3. The opening words of chap. 38, "Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge," can hardly be supposed to refer to Elihu and are yet difficult to explain as referring to Job's soliloquy in chap. 31, if six chapters of discussion have intervened. The connection is not impossible, but it would be more natural if chap. 38 followed immediately on chap. 31. This impression is strengthened by the fact that the appearance of Yahweh seems a direct response to Job's demand for a hearing in the last verses of chap. 31.

4. The introduction of a new speaker at this point in the poem is a surprising and inartistic development. After the round of the dialogues and Job's final cry, the moment is certainly ripe for the *dénouement*. The special prose introduction, however, loses much of its significance when vv. 2-5 in chap. 32 are considered a secondary addition. The remaining verses say no more than the entrance of a new speaker would demand. Even Elihu's symbolic name need not call for remark, if he was intended as the bearer of the poet's answer.

5. One assumption of the defenders of these speeches is, however, without justification. It is by no means self-evident that a later writer would have taken more pains to unite his work with the original poem. His undertaking bore no stamp of dishonesty in his own eyes and he was not on his guard against the methods of modern criticism. Elihu's author was not an interpolator, in the real sense of the word; full of the urgency of his message, he takes no particular thought for the niceties of the dramatic situation. Kuenen suggests that the subscription after chap. 31 is intended to indicate that the following chapters are from another hand.

Style.—1. A notable peculiarity of the Elihu Speeches is their marked Aramaic coloring. Kautzsch states the proportion of Aramaisms as follows: there are thirty-two distinct Aramaisms in Job and eighty-four occurrences; in chaps. 32-37, which constitute one-seventh of the book, there are thirteen Aramaisms with thirty-

one occurrences. The explanation that Elihu is designedly given an Aramaic vocabulary is decidedly artificial and improbable. Such characterization is not in the manner of a Hebrew poet.

2. Elihu has certain peculiarities of speech which set him apart from the other speakers. Kautzsch¹ enumerates eight words used nine times, which are used only by Elihu. Such words are mentioned in the notes on the text. There are in addition phrases and usages which distinguish these chapters from the others; different words are used to express familiar conceptions; the poetical suffixes, which characterize the poem, are almost never employed. Elihu announces his intention to speak frequently, and calls upon Job to give heed. "To make known knowledge" or "wisdom" are favorite phrases on his lips. Only Elihu speaks of God as "opening the ear of man," and numerous other expressions are his alone.

3. Elihu alone addresses Job by name though plural and singular forms would have sufficed to distinguish those addressed.

4. The accurate quotation of Job's words or those of the friends is without parallel in the dialogue. Although Elihu is refuting Job's accusations, the hearers who had been present at the debate might have been expected to understand the allusions without a literal rehearsal of the remarks. The manner is rather that of a later reader and critic than of the poet in the heat of composition.

5. The poetry of these chapters is almost uniformly inferior to the rest of the poem. Not only prosaic phrasing and frequent lack of rhythm justify this verdict, but a marked lack of the splendid imaginativeness of the poem itself. Figures are less frequent and less vivid and the diction is less fresh and suggestive. There is a reiteration and monotony of style strangely in contrast to the earlier chapters, though all are cast in the same poetic mold. The difference is very apparent with a form of verse which only too readily degenerates into mere singsong. No one who has attempted to translate the chapters and retain the Hebrew form can fail to have felt their essentially unpoetic quality. They are the work of an author whose lesson was of first importance, whose verse was only a conventional form in which to offer it.

In view of this uniform inferiority, the suggestion that the speeches represent unfinished material of the poet fails to be convincing.

¹ *Die Aramaismen im Alten Testament*, 1 Theil (1902).

Content.—Judgment as to whether the poet has given an answer to the problem he has so relentlessly exposed will necessarily be subjective, therefore divided. The poem is not a mere philosophic debate; it is a record of human experience; and the conclusions of the two are to be differently estimated.

There is some justification for those who find no satisfying solution in the poem if Elihu is excluded from it. The arguments of the friends have only that measure of truth which the traditional and obvious belief must always contain. In spite of Friedrich Delitzsch's characterization of the poem as "Das Hohelied des Pessimismus," we cannot believe that Job's passionate challenge of the universe is its own excuse for being. There is something beyond, something toward which Job is fighting his way.

And then, say the advocates of the Elihu Speeches, Yahweh speaks to Job from the whirlwind not to make clear his hidden purpose, but to overwhelm Job by a swift panorama of his great and unknowable universe; to flash scorn upon him that he has dared to measure himself with the All-powerful and All-wise; to bring his helpless creature into abject submission. Is this an answer worthy of the poet? There is no solving of the mystery; if this is the poet's last word, it is a mere passive fatalistic relinquishing of the struggle.

But Job had come face to face with the Infinite, had seen life and the universe for a moment in the light of the Eternal.

I had heard of thee by the hearing of the ear;
But now mine eye seeth thee,
Wherefore I abhor myself, and repent
In dust and ashes.

Without either an explanation or his justification, he was satisfied. Not an answer, only a vision, was the end of the poet's search. And the vision, perhaps, is not wholly satisfying—yet magnificent, worthy of a great poet and the heroic spirit who had lived out his life drama in such torture of soul. For solution he found, at last, only the simple religious one of trust in a love and wisdom that are beyond man's knowing.

Are we to demand that he should have given something more positive and definite, should have closed the argument with words

of wisdom on the meaning of suffering? The assumption that he must have done so in order to justify the writing of the poem seems unwarrantable and pedantic. If we must needs have an explanation, it will have to be sought with Elihu.

Here also, opinions vary regarding the freshness and value of Elihu's contribution. His message, which must be regarded primarily as that of the chastening educative purpose of suffering, is not by him first suggested. Eliphaz has undoubtedly expressed its essence in 5:17 and the following verses. Yet it cannot there represent the poet's final answer to the wherefore of suffering and sorrow, nor is the idea elsewhere in the dialogue resumed. By Elihu, however, it is proclaimed with the consciousness of fresh wisdom and the stamp of finality. He has taken a phase of the truth, as the poet saw it, and offered it as a complete explanation for the problem. In so far Elihu brings the only positive solution which the poem affords.

But the question is not whether the chapters furnish a positive answer, a valuable and true thought on the great problem—one, perhaps, religiously higher than anything in the poem itself—but whether it is the poet's solution. Would he have chosen to touch upon this thought, put it aside with the other inadequate words of the friends, and then introduce it at the close of the debate as an all-sufficient explanation? Would he have introduced another speaker of superior wisdom to develop and reiterate the idea at such length?

And yet another question must be raised. Chap. 37 anticipates the manner and the conception of the Yahweh Speeches. They do not in reality make the grandeur of the divine revelation superfluous, but they detract from its unique glory. The theory that they prepare for the Theophany by a description of the gathering storm is quite improbable. Apart from the question of the unity of the description, its failure to justify such a hypothesis has often been pointed out. The thunderstorm is followed by snow, a summer heaven, and, at the very moment before Yahweh appears in the whirlwind, by the clear windswept skies. This marring of his masterful conclusion is hardly to be ascribed to the poet. And there is more than a suggestion in 33:13—37:23 f. that a direct answer of Yahweh to Job is neither necessary nor fitting.

The content of the speeches, then, whatever its value, does not tend to contradict the evidence of style and connection against a common authorship for the Elihu Speeches and Job. It is indeed, as has often been said, the cumulative force of the various arguments which brings conviction—that, and an open-minded reading of the whole section.

DATE OF JOB

The chief critical problems which the Elihu Speeches offer having been considered, it is in order to question the probable date of the original poem and that of its chief supplement in relation to it. Without attempting to follow in detail a criticism which has steadily brought forward the date of Job, its progress may be suggested by a general statement.

The Talmudists and Michaelis among early critics believed it came from the hand of the great Lawgiver. This was probably the opinion of the makers of the Syriac Canon, for the book finds a place in the Peshitta between the Pentateuch and Joshua. Bishop Lowth, Stuhlmann, and Eichhorn considered it pre-Mosaic.

Its Wisdom character was sufficient to convince Luther, Haevernick, Hahn, Delitzsch, and others that it must belong to the age of Solomon. A date about 770 B.C. was suggested by Renan. A large number of scholars have dated the poem after the fall of the Northern Kingdom in the course of the seventh century; among them are: Ewald, Merx, Reuss, Stickel, De Wette, Schrader, Hirzel, Hitzig. Koenig places it at the very end of this century; Ley and Wright in the early years of the sixth.

For a composition in the period of the Exile declare themselves Umbreit, Dillmann, Davidson, Bickell, and Driver. The Persian period is favored by Vatke, Studer, Hoffmann, Margoliouth, Cheyne, Duhm. Kuenen and Budde consider a date not far from 400 B.C. one most in accord with the character of the book, while Holtzmann and Wildeboer bring it down to the Greek period. Cornill declares the book one of the latest in the Old Testament, and Siegfried would assign it apparently to the Maccabean period.

A date before Jeremiah it is hardly necessary to consider. The famous passages Job 3:3 f., 10:18 expressing Job's curse upon his birth in words so like Jeremiah's (20:14–18) must be adjudged, as

Cornill has pronounced, an artistic reshaping of the spontaneous cry of the prophet. The mention of Job with the patriarchs Noah and Daniel in Ezek. 14:14, 20 certainly presupposes a knowledge of the legend of "patient Job" rather than the poet's impatient hero. Ezek., chap. 18, which denies the existence of its problem, would scarcely have been written after the poem.

It need only be remembered that the poem is essentially a product of the Wisdom Literature, to suggest an exilic, if not post-exilic, date. This form of literary expression grew out of a time when the irrevocable overthrow of the nation had perforce shifted the emphasis to the individual. Purely religious sentiments in this time found expression in psalms; moral and philosophical reflections in the Wisdom poetry.

Job stands in close relation to both these forms of literature. The cry of despair in Ps. 88 is very like Job's complaints, and Pss. 38, 39 are pleas of more submissive sufferers. Special verses in many psalms are so strikingly similar that the two can hardly be independent. Compare for instance Ps. 8:5 and Job 7:17; Ps. 103:16 and Job 7:10*b*; Ps. 107:40-42 and Job 12:21, 24. In the first of these instances Job is almost certainly parodying the Psalmist's question, but to attempt to establish the priority in the numerous related passages would be comparatively useless, since the dating of the Psalms is so uncertain. Ps. 49 shows a special resemblance to the form of Wisdom literature, and Ps. 37 touches upon the Job problem.

Before discussing the relation of the poem to the other books of this character, the kinship between it and Deutero-Isaiah should be considered. Were there not remarkable likeness in forms of expression, the problem which absorbs the two authors would indicate that they were not separated by long periods of years. Only after the Exile did the problem of undeserved suffering become a burning one. The most natural inference from the form which the problem assumes is that Deutero-Isaiah's presentation is the earlier, for in Hebrew thought the individualistic development always followed the national. This probability is strengthened by the conditions which the two books represent. In Deutero-Isaiah the Captivity is the great and terrible reality; release from it the great

hope. The background of Job is not overwhelming national disaster and despair, but a time of comparatively peaceful and settled conditions. There is oppression, but it is of the poor and weak by the rich and strong. Only echoes of the national calamity are heard (Job 12:17 f.).

The unity and world government of Yahweh, which Deutero-Isaiah maintains, stand in Job beyond question. Absolute and universal monotheism is the postulate of the poem. True, the poem in its wider aspect found an answer which the author of Job does not even suggest. Cheyne for this reason believes that the Servant Passages are a later addition to the Deutero-Isaiah—a kind of commentary on Job (cf. Isa., chap. 53). But it may well be that the troubled poet found no significance for the personal problem in the solution of vicarious suffering. Passages like those in Job 14:2 and Isa. 40:7; Job 9:8 and Isa. 44:24; Job 15:35 and Isa. 59:4; Job 13:28 and Isa. 50:9, 51:8; Job 26:12 and Isa. 51:9; Job 30:21 and Isa. 63:10, resemble each other so closely that one writer must be dependent on the other. The glorification of God in nature which reaches its height in the Yahweh Speeches of Job is a marked characteristic of the prophet of the Exile. Comparison tends to show that the author of Job wrote after the time of Deutero-Isaiah.

The presentation of the same problem of undeserved suffering in Malachi strengthens this conclusion. The complaint of the people, as expressed by the later prophet (Mal. 1:2; 2:17; 3:13-15) is more akin to Job's cry than anything in Deutero-Isaiah. Kuenen and Budde have laid particular stress on this relationship. "It availeth not a man to serve God; the wicked prosper as the just." But it is to be noted in Malachi that the complaint is the general pessimistic declaration of the unthinking. When Job, on the other hand, voiced his protest, it came as a shock to the prevailing belief of his time, expressed in the attitude of the friends. Much of the significance of that protest against the old doctrine of retribution is lost, if we are to suppose the thought already a commonplace of the time. It is at all events clear that the two books must have arisen under similar conditions, but to the poet should probably be credited the first sharp formulating of the question.

Alleged traces of the completed Hexateuch in Job are naturally

only incidental and not sufficient to be regarded as conclusive evidence for date. Such are found in Job 21:12; 30:31; Gen. 4:21; 31:27; Job 42:11; Gen. 33:19. The P phrase at the conclusion of the book is, however, quite unmistakable, and if the Epilogue in this form represents the original conclusion of the poem, a date after 444 B.C. would be practically certain.

As the supreme product of the Wisdom literature, Job should be studied especially in relation to the other books of this character. Its relationship with Proverbs, chaps. 1-9—by general consent the latest section of the book—is of the greatest importance. The judgment of scholars has, however, been divided on this question. Seyring¹ and Strack,² who have given it special treatment, believe Job the earlier, but Merx, Davidson, Kuenen, Budde, Cornill, and others have affirmed the opposite opinion.

The closest resemblance is found between Prov. 3:14; 8:11, 19, and Job 28:15-19. This is of little significance for the date of Job because the entire twenty-eighth chapter is very generally admitted to be later than the poem and these particular verses are probably a still later addition. Other passages undoubtedly related are Job 5:17, 18; Prov. 3:11, 12; Job 15:7; 38:6; Prov. 8:25; Job 26:10; Prov. 8:27b; Job 38:10, 11; Prov. 8:29. A remarkable fact is that the passages mentioned in Proverbs are grouped in the third and eighth chapters.

We find a very convincing reason for considering the author of Prov. chaps. 1-9 the borrower in the fact that the conception of Wisdom is there far more developed and stereotyped than in Job. It is closer to that in Ben Sira (chaps. 1, 24). Toy³ in his commentary on Proverbs by a comparison of technical, ethical terms in Job, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes reaches the conclusion that, "Job is nearer Proverbs in the diction which the latter shares with the Psalter. We may thence probably infer that the philosophical conception of Wisdom is less developed in Job than in Proverbs, and that the former book is earlier than the latter."

Borrowing by the poet of Job has been assumed as certain in 15:7 (cf. Prov. 8:25), but this conclusion may be doubted. There

¹ *Die Abhängigkeit der Sprüche Salomonis Kap. i-ix. von Hiob* (1889).

² *St. Kr.* (1896), S. 609 f.

³ "Proverbs," *International Critical Commentary* (1899), 24 f.

is no obvious allusion to personified Wisdom in Eliphaz' scornful question, which might well have been suggested by expressions in Deutero-Isaiah (cf. 40:21, 22; 44:24; 45:18, 21) proclaiming the wisdom of the Lord from the beginning in the creation of the world. Eliphaz' question might thus refer to a wisdom arising from age-long existence and the answer in vv. 9, 10 scoff at Job's pretensions in the face of older men than himself. A later writer in Proverbs may have employed the phrase, with others from the Yahweh Speeches, for his praise of eternal Wisdom. The entire description Prov. 8:22-31 seems to presuppose the Yahweh Speeches rather than serve as an inspiration for them. Kuenen has suggested that the two authors may have been contemporaries.

The earlier sections of Proverbs were very probably known and used by Job's author. Compare Prov. 13:9; 24:20 with Job 18:5, 6; 21:17; Prov. 15:11 with Job 26:6; Prov. 16:15 with Job 29:23, 24.

For the establishment of date it is hardly necessary to consider the relation of Job with Ecclesiastes or Ben Sira. The diction of both these later books exhibits new verbal forms, late syntactical usages, neo-Hebraisms, Aramaisms, etc., which indicate a far more decadent stage of the language than that of Job.¹

There is only one definite reference to Job in Ecclesiastes (Eccles. 5:14; Job 1:21). Sira quotes the poem frequently, though freely, as though the book had belonged to his Canon and been studied. Compare Sir. 4:10 with Job 31:16, 18; Sir. 14:17, 19 with Job 13:28; Sir. 43:27, 32 with Job 26:14 and the description of the phenomena of nature in Sir. 43:13 f. with various portions of the Yahweh Speeches. Special use seems to have been made of Job, chap. 28 (cf. Sira, chap. 1). Moreover, Job is mentioned in the list of famous men (Sir. 49:9, Heb. text) where we should perhaps read an emended text, "He also mentioned Job the upright who uttered right words." (Cf. art. "Job," *Enc. Bib.*)

If, as seems very probable, Job has been quoted by the author of Prov., chaps. 1-9, and Ben Sira, Cornill's contention that the poem exercised no influence on Hebrew literature would be unfounded.

¹ Cf. Lèvi, *Hebrew Text of the Book of Ecclesiasticus* (1904), p. 12, and the glossary of non-biblical words at the end; Barton, "Ecclesiastes" (*Inter. Critical Commentary*; 1908), pp. 52 f.

Cheyne¹ believed Ps. 88 imitative of Job and also other passages in later psalms (p. 84).

A literary-historical investigation thus suggests a date not earlier than the last third of the fifth century. Linguistic evidence would forbid placing the poem at a much later date. To postulate Greek² or Egyptian³ influence because of the dialogue form of the poem seems quite unnecessary. Job stands alone in many respects in Hebrew literature; the form is not an artificial one and is peculiarly adapted to the author's purpose. The conceptions of the poem are essentially Hebraic, though freed from nationalistic bias.

Certain special conceptions of the poem, which have a bearing upon the question of date, should be mentioned. The Satan of the Prologue is unknown in pre-exilic literature and may possibly bear a relation to the Persian Ahriman. Satan in Zech., chap. 3, appears as the adversary of the righteous in the heavenly council; in the Prologue of Job he is still a servant of Yahweh, though of evil intent. The latter conception seems the earlier form, but since the Prologue and Epilogue are probably not the poet's own creation, the evidence for date is not of so much significance. A later stage of development is clearly indicated in Chronicles, where the name of Satan is mentioned without the article. The council of the Bene Elohim in the Prologue and several references to angelic beings in the poem (4:18; 5:1; 15:15; 38:7) indicate post-exilic thought. In later thinking the distance between God and men was ever widening, and there was a tendency to create hosts of subordinate heavenly beings as intermediaries. In Daniel the angels have become organized into hierarchies and have been assigned special functions. No such developed conception is suggested in Job.

The ethical standard of the time, expressed in Job's soliloquy (chaps. 29-31), is high. The Deuteronomic law is certainly presupposed as the code of society and in a few instances definitely indicated (Deut. 19:14; Job 24:2; Deut. 17:2 f.; 4:19; Job 31:26-28).

The various lines of evidence—literary and linguistic, and that of social and religious conditions—agree best with a date not far from 400 B.C., which Kuenen and Budde have advocated.

¹ *Job and Solomon*, p. 88.

² Cf. Friedländer, *Griechische Philosophie im Alten Testament* (1904), S. 90 f.

³ Cf. Gunkel, *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des Neuen Testaments*, S. 27.

THE COMPOSITION OF THE ELIHU SPEECHES

Discussion has continued so long and so determinedly concerning the relationship of the Elihu Speeches to the original poem, that comparatively little attention has been given to the literary and textual problems which these speeches offer. Hoffmann and Budde have recognized 32:2-5 as a secondary addition to the text, while Bickell and Hatch¹ have omitted numerous passages in accordance with the evidence of Origen's Hexapla and the Sahidic version. Siegfried, Budde, Duham, and others have excluded on various grounds a number of verses as glosses.

In the insistence, however, upon the fact that these speeches are a later and inferior supplement to the poem, much lack of unity and many surprising inconsistencies have been laid to the charge of Elihu's verbose and awkward style. That the poetic diction and style of these chapters are far inferior to those of the original poet has already been recognized. This contrast remains even though a careful analysis of the chapters suggests the possibility of more than one author as an explanation for some faults of construction and curious inconsistencies.

For the sake of greater clearness in the following discussion it seems best to state at once the main outlines of the suggested analysis.

1. Chap. 34 (with the exception of vv. 28-33) is regarded as the work of an author different from the writer of the remaining chapters—not a supplementer of the Elihu Speeches but a second commentator on the Job poem.

2. The passage 32:11-16 is assumed as the probable introduction to chap. 34; 35:15, 16 are included with chap. 34.

3. The passage 32:2-5 of the prose introduction is treated as the addition of an editor who combined 32:11-16 and chap. 34 with the original Elihu Speeches.

4. The sections 34:28-33; 36:7b-9, 10b-13, 16, 17 and 36:26, 27b, 28a, 29-32; 37:2-5a, 6b, 11-12b, 13, which are shown by Origen's Hexapla and the Sahidic version to have been lacking in the primitive LXX text, are regarded as later interpolations. They are not taken into consideration in the general discussion of the chapters

¹ *Essays in Biblical Greek* (1889), pp. 215 f.

but reserved for special treatment. In the following discussion the reasons for the above analysis are set forth. For special questions of the text the notes on the text must be compared.

There is at least no intrinsic improbability in the hypothesis of a double authorship for the Elihu Speeches. If these speeches represent, as Cheyne has so aptly suggested, "the first theological criticism" on Job they might include the attempt of not one but two or more zealous pietists to correct the errors of Job and set the book in a proper religious light. No staunch defender of orthodoxy would have been unaware of the dangerous heresy of Job's protest; more than one might have been impelled to issue a supplementary tract or reply which would counteract its harmful tendencies and make the poem acceptable to the eyes of orthodoxy. Such criticisms might be immediately attached to the poem or might circulate for a time separately and be combined later by another hand with the original poem.

The tendency to reform and improve Job, shown by insertions and transpositions in the body of the poem, has been recognized in different degrees by most modern critics of the book. The theories of Hoffmann, Grill, and Laue may be mentioned in this connection; Duhm, Siegfried, and other commentators have a considerable list of interpolations. It is generally admitted that some transposition and rearrangement of the text must explain the failure of the symmetrical scheme of the poem after chap. 24 and the remarkable development of the thought.

Admitting the fact of such transpositions and corrective additions, the natural place for any considerable supplement or sustained attempt at criticism would be at the point where the original dialogue ceased. The somewhat rigid scheme of dialogue could here be disregarded and, by the simple device of the introduction of another speaker, opportunity would thus be afforded for free comment on the poem. That the Elihu Speeches represent such a supplement has been generally admitted, but the possibility of more than one critic has not, to the writer's knowledge, been suggested.

In 1875 Studer¹ advanced the theory that the entire poem represented the efforts of a School of Wise Men toward the solution of the

¹ *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie*, IV, S. 688-723.

problem of suffering; that its present form was due to an editorial hand which had gathered together the various contributions. He cited in support of his theory 15:2, 18; 34:2, 34. The latter verses undoubtedly suggest a Wise Men's debate, and this suggestion will be considered later.

This composition theory, which Cheyne has also supported in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, is impossible as an explanation for the original poem—the impassioned utterance of a great poet and a giant spirit. Moreover, the unified and symmetrical structure of the dialogue could hardly have resulted from such a process. The explanation is far too mechanical for the poem itself; but that a school of Wise Men and orthodox teachers later laid hands on the poem to correct and supplement it, seems more than probable. Kuenen's suggestion is entirely credible—that the book might never have found a place in the Canon without the reshaping of a hand guided by a more orthodox piety. Chaps. 32-37 of Job, which we know under the name of the Elihu Speeches, apparently represent the criticisms of two such would-be champions of orthodoxy. And as theological critics admittedly seldom agree, so these two have pondered the problem of Job's trials from rather different points of view.

The Wise Man who composed the supplement to Job comprised in chaps. 32, 33, 35-37 believed himself in possession of a solution of the problem of suffering more satisfying than any which the author of Job had found—a solution which it was his divine mission to enunciate. So convinced is he of the inspired nature of his message, that in true Hebrew fashion he identifies his thought with that of God (32:8; 36:4) and considers himself a champion of the divine righteousness (36:2, 3). It is his to "assert Eternal Providence, and justify the ways of God to men." He will show that God does answer men's cries for light though Job has bitterly maintained his indifference. His very suffering, if Job did but know it, is God's message to him; its interpretation is to be sought through the medium of dreams and visions, or of an interpreter, who shall declare the meaning of his affliction and, bringing him to a humble spirit, procure his redemption (33:14-24).

This, then, is Elihu's God-given illumination. Suffering is to be regarded not as the visitation of God's wrath upon sin—the belief

of the friends and the essence of the old doctrine of retribution—but as a chastening, soul-purifying process, the testing of God to try out the baser elements in a man. The idea is not so entirely new or so remarkable as its author imagines. Already Eliphaz in 5:17 has suggested the thought of a loving purpose of God behind punishment.

Behold, happy is the man whom God correcteth:
Therefore, despise not thou the chastening of the Almighty.
For He maketh sore and bindeth up;
He woundeth, and His hands make whole.

But the poet did not offer it as a solution of the eternal mystery of suffering. To Elihu's author it seemed sufficient both for the universal problem and Job's particular case. The poet's tremendous upheavals of spirit and wild challenge of the Infinite were utterly strange to him. His pious faith did not question beyond the limits of the conventional; the problem in all its desperate reality he had never faced. Out of theological reflection, not profound experience, is born his answer to the Job problem.

He, scarcely more than the friends, accepts Job's protest of entire innocence but he is willing to admit that Job's reward far outweighs his desert, and finds, in this theory of the educative purpose of suffering, an answer to the enigma. Inadequate as the solution is, it yet springs from a far higher ethical and religious conception of God than that of the friends and represents the only possible categorical answer to the problem before which the poet leaves Job and his reader uncomprehending but satisfied. Elihu's theme, frequently reiterated, is expressed in 33:17, 30; it is God's purpose—

To turn a man from his way,
To cause him to cease from his pride.
.
.
.
To bring back his soul from destruction,
To enlighten with the light of life.

(Cf. also 36:15, 18, 19, 21.)

It is the word of a lower range of spirit and a narrower piety than that of the author of the original poem, but it is the expression of a sincere faith in a loving God—not to be lightly valued as a contribution to the religious problem.

Elihu believed himself to be, in the opinion of the writer, the interpreter through whom God would make known to Job the meaning of his pain. This interpretation of the much-quoted passage 33:23 f. is entirely in accordance with Elihu's attitude as an ambassador, divinely appointed to enlighten Job's darkness. The text problem is more fully discussed in the notes on the passage, but the context and meter of v. 23 make it very probable that the word "angel" is a later gloss. The significance of "the interpreter" was not understood and the allusion was supposed to be to an angel. In v. 22 we should read, "to death," rather than "to the deathbringers"; nothing else in the passage suggests a supernatural agent. The word translated "interpreter" is nowhere else in the Old Testament used of a supernatural being, but represents an ambassador. Such a conception of a definite intercessor with God does not appear in any other passage. Elihu is here arrogating to himself the office of the Daysman for whom Job has longed (9:33). He will lay his hand, so to speak, on both, and become interpreter between God and man.

This conception of his high mission would explain, and in part excuse, Elihu's attitude toward Job and the poet—the kindly tolerance of superior insight. Half apologetically he begins, explaining his previous silence on the ground of his youth and his present entrance into the discussion by the compelling impetus of his inspiration (32:18, 19, 20). It is not perhaps too fanciful to imagine in the plea of a younger speaker a slight justification of the writer's addition to the work of the earlier poet. The poet has failed of the solution which he, Elihu, knows himself fitted to bring to the demands of the perplexed and despairing Job. The tone of his remarks to Job, is, therefore, that of serious, kindly admonition, not of severe condemnation. He assures Job (33:6, 7), in words which echo the hero's cries, that he has nothing to fear from him; chides him for his misunderstanding of God's dealings with him (33:8-13); bids him answer if he find reply, "for I would justify thee"; reveals the meaning of his suffering (33:17 f.), and admonishes him not to thwart God's benevolent purpose by rebellion and haughtiness (36:18, 21). "But the wise in their own sight he regardeth not," are his last words of counsel to Job.

Elihu would bring Job to a better mind, illumine for him the

mysterious ways of Providence and find the ransom of his soul in a humble submission to the chastening hand (33:24; 36:18). It was the virtuous aim with which the friends began their exhortation to Job, but they early let their suspicion appear, that his great suffering must be the reward of equally great sin; stung by Job's irony they launch at last into violent denunciation of him. Elihu, undisturbed by reply, and serene in the consciousness of his God-given wisdom, pursues his mild-mannered homily to the end.

After his introductory remarks Elihu turns his attention exclusively to Job, and, with the exception of a casual mention in 35:4, the friends are not again brought into the discussion. With Job alone Elihu carries on his argument, often addressing the hero by name and calling on him to give heed (33:1, 5, 31 f.; 36:2; 37:14). In the manner of his direct address to Job, Elihu maintains the form of the dialogue, though Job is there never called by name.

Chap. 34.—If the foregoing summary suggests with any degree of correctness the prevailing spirit and manner of Elihu's exhortation to Job, chap. 34 stands out in sharp distinction from it. Both in style and thought chap. 34 separates itself from the other chapters; the manner of its introduction at once arouses suspicion. In 33:31–33 Elihu has just concluded an exhortation to Job:

If thou hast words give me answer;
 Speak then, for I would justify thee;
 Else give thou ear unto me,
 Hold thy peace, I will teach thee wisdom.

It is singular to find this followed in 34:2–4 by an abrupt call to the Wise Men—who appear only in this section—to enter into judgment with the speaker on Job's case.

Hear now, ye Wise Men, my words,
 Ye of knowledge, give ear unto me.

Various transpositions of this verse or of the address to Job in 33:31–33 have been suggested, but they do not obviate the difficulty. Upon the address in 34:2–4 follows a long arraignment of Job, directed exclusively to the Wise Men; in which Job is not addressed, but always mentioned in the third person; in which he is, moreover, mercilessly condemned as a blasphemer and "man of iniquity." The speaker forgets entirely the situation and the personal attitude

which Elihu maintains, and places us—as Meinhold has remarked, though in different connection—in the atmosphere of a Wise Men’s discussion or rabbinical debate.

It cannot be maintained that the Wise Men (34:2–4, 34), who are to listen to the arraignment of Job and confirm judgment against him, represent merely the friends. Their wisdom has already (32:11–16) been set aside. They may possibly be tacitly included, but it is a far wider audience of Wise Men—possibly understanding readers—whom the author summons to his hearing of the case. The presence of the suffering Job and his friends fades into the past to which they already, for this author, belonged. Job is tried and condemned before the court of the Wise Men with no opportunity for defense; the entire chapter is a polemic not only against Job but also against the poet of his sorrows.

No trace of the solution which Elihu has attempted to bring to Job’s aid appears; no hint of any new answer to the problem or the theory of chastening which is Elihu’s *raison d’être*. The argument is somewhat as follows. Job has accused God of injustice (34:5, 6); this is blasphemous and he thereby reveals himself as a sinner (34:7, 8). God’s punishments are always the just recompense of a man’s deeds (34:10, 11, 12); he is alone powerful—therefore alone just; and he recompenses evil deeds without regard to power or station (34:13–26). Job’s punishment is great; he must, then, have greatly sinned and his mad outcries for justice but heap sin upon sin (34:37). The matter will be so viewed by every true Wise Man who recognizes the unimpeachable justice of the supreme God (34:34, 35).

Here is the old recompense theory, against which Job’s author has contended, set forth in all its baldness, more harshly than by the friends. It suffices to explain the entire government of the universe. The author of chap. 34 has no touch of sympathy with the soul struggles of a Job under the apparent injustice of Providence; he will bring no theory with which to meet Job’s difficulty but expose with finality the errors of the hero for the benefit of those who hear and read his protest. Verily Job and his author “speak without knowledge” and their “words are without understanding.”

The author of chap. 34 viewed neither Job’s protest nor the divine government with the eyes of the original Elihu writer. The

harshness of his doctrine of recompense compares ill with the real religious depth of Elihu's theory and his sympathy toward Job. The former's is a God of power and justice, the latter's one of power and love.

One further argument for the separation of chap. 34 from the chapters which precede and follow should be mentioned. Whereas 34:2 is quite out of place after 33:33, 35:2 forms an admirable continuation of Elihu's address to Job in 33:33. The entire thirty-fifth chapter carries on consistently the tone and manner of chap. 33. Canons of literary criticism both formal and material would thus lead us to distinguish two lines of thought and two authors in the Elihu Speeches.

32:11-16.—Though chap. 34 might form an independent whole, there is needed a fuller introduction, which is to be found in 32:11-16. That section destroys the continuity of chap. 32 and falls out of the manner and tone of Elihu's introduction. V. 11, "Behold I waited for your words," appears to begin a second explanation of the situation which vv. 6-10 have already made perfectly clear. The obvious weak duplication of v. 10 by v. 17 suggests very decidedly that a section has been inserted after v. 10, and v. 17 added to restore the original connection. V. 18 continues far better than any of the intervening verses the thread of vv. 8-10 and the present sequence of vv. 15-17 f. is extremely awkward if not impossible. V. 16, which is usually read as a question, has no interrogative particle, and, though an omitted one may be assumed, the natural rendering is declarative. The difficulties of the section have been recognized by recent critics of the speeches and they have resorted to various schemes of transposition to relieve the situation. (The suggestions are given in the notes on the text.)

The primitive LXX omitted a part of this section—a part of v. 11, vv. 12, 15, 16. V. 17 was paraphrased by the line, "Answering, Elihu said, 'I will speak again.'" It is possible that the exemplar employed by the LXX translator may have showed some indications of insertion here, which led to the omission of a few verses, but it is not at all probable that the translator did not read the verses. The combination of the two documents by an editor must have taken place long before a LXX translation, and the explanation of this

omission lies probably in a marked tendency of the LXX to avoid useless repetition. Vv. 11, 12, 15, 16, when one has already read the early part of the chapter, cannot be said to add anything to the statement of the case. This is recognized by every intelligent reader, and hence much abuse of Elihu's style.

For this very reason the verses are not easily explained as a mere gloss. We agree with Dillmann's¹ opinion that if the verses had not been at hand they would not have been added. There was no further need for explanation; the silence of the friends had been stated, Elihu's entrance justified, and his apology made. A gloss should have some shadow of excuse for its insertion.

As a parallel introduction, transferred here from its place at the head of chap. 34 by the combiner of the two documents, the section vv. 11-16 is far more intelligible. The verses correspond to the tone of chap. 34 in indignation that Job has not been condemned (v. 12) and in absence of any respect for the poet's answer (vv. 13, 14). The answer of this speaker is to be far more trenchant. No word is here addressed to Job, and in v. 12 he is mentioned by name as in 34:5, 7, 35, 36. In vv. 15, 16 the author drops altogether the thin disguise of the dramatic situation which he has assumed and speaks of the friends also in the third person. Their wisdom has not availed to condemn Job; therefore,

Hear now, ye Wise Men, my words,
Ye of knowledge, give ear unto me.

The motives expressed in the two introductions are those which correspond to the character of the two arguments. That of Elihu is impelled by consciousness of a new and divine inspiration, that of the anti-Job author by moral indignation against the friends for failing to reprove Job summarily and completely.

Only two other verses in the Elihu chapters should be placed with 32:11-16 and chap. 34. These are the last two verses of chap. 35, which have caused much difficulty in their present position.

1. It is clear that they do not properly follow after 35:14, unless the text is radically emended, whereas 36:2 forms a natural continuation of the suspended sentence in 35:14.²

¹ *Sitzungsberichte der kgl. Akademie zu Berlin* (1890), Bd. II, S. 1345.

² The headings of the chapters may be disregarded as editorial imitations of those in the preceding dialogue. Since Elihu is not answered, it is obvious that the formula has no significance and it often interrupts the continuity of the address.

35:14 Yea, for thou sayest thou beholdest Him not,
 Thy cause is before Him, thou waitest for Him,—
 36:2 Suffer me a little, that I may show thee
 For I have yet words for God.

2. The introductory וְעַתָּה "and now" of v. 15 should evidently preface a summary of what has preceded. To read the verse at the end of chap. 35 followed by 36:2 destroys the significance of the construction.

3. The verses bear the distinctive characteristics of chap. 34; they speak of Job in the third person, and utter his condemnation in the familiar phrase "without knowledge."

4. The primitive LXX omitted these verses. The verses are hardly a duplication of what has been said and it seems possible that the translator did not read them in this place. The alternative of arbitrary omission is, however, also possible.

The natural place for these two verses is before 34:34 and after 34:27, omitting the later insertion of vv. 28-33. In that position they bring the charge against Job after the account of God's visitations upon the wicked in 34:20-27. Vv. 34, 35 of chap. 34 then introduce the appeal to the verdict of the Wise Men, parallel to that in 34:2-4; v. 37 adds the appropriate conclusion to the drastic judgment pronounced on Job. The verses probably owe their position at the end of chap. 35 to accidental displacement. They were probably displaced from their original position by the insertion of 34:28-33 and a later hand gave them their present place, perhaps because of a supposed connection with 35:13.

Much ingenuity has been exercised in an effort to relieve the awkwardness of that position. Bickell and Hatch, of course, omit the verses, while Duhm and Beer transpose v. 16 after v. 8 and connect v. 15 with 36:2. The suggestion can hardly be regarded as attractive or convincing. A much more satisfactory solution is afforded by the analysis suggested above, which connects the verses with chap. 34.

The argument of the second Wise Man would thus include 32:11-16; 34:1-27; 35:15, 16; 34:33-37. No very elaborate process of combination and transposition is necessary to account for the addition of such a document to the other Elihu sec-

tions. The activity of the editor or combiner seems to have been confined to the transposition of 32:11-16 to place it with the other introduction; the addition of vv. 2-5 of the prose introduction and a few rather meaningless glosses (e.g., 34:10, 16), intended to emphasize the application of the argument.

32:2-5.—This repetitious and clumsy portion of the prose introduction has been recognized by Hoffmann and Budde as a secondary addition to the chapter. There are several considerations which make this conclusion probable.

1. V. 2 introduces Elihu ceremoniously as Elihu, the son of Barachel, the Buzite, of the tribe of Ram. In v. 6 he is again formally introduced, this time without the designation "of the tribe of Ram." If v. 2 had originally preceded, the formula of v. 6 would naturally have read, "And Elihu answered and said," or "Elihu, the Buzite, answered and said," in the fashion of the early dialogue.

2. The verses add to our knowledge nothing which is not to be gathered in poetic form from the remainder of the chapter. It would be a remarkably stupid author who took pains to state at length in prose the content of his immediately following verses.

3. The section appears like an awkward summary of the parallel introductions in 32:6-10, 18-22; 32:11-16. There is an attempt to unite the reasons offered by Elihu for his appearance and those of the second Wise Man. The result is a most unfortunate combination, in which Elihu's anger is four distinct times enkindled. Vv. 3, 5 correspond to vv. 11-13, while v. 4 answers to vv. 6, 7.

It has been the fashion to accuse the unfortunate Elihu of every form of literary transgression, but if he could be relieved of the meaningless repetition of chap. 32, the gravest accusation against him would be removed. The other sections may be often bombastic and wordy—seldom sublime—but they are nowhere so intolerable as chap. 32 in its present form.

If any probability has been established for the hypothesis of a double authorship of the Elihu sections, it is most natural to suppose that this curious and awkward prose introduction is the work of an editor or combiner, who thought thus to unite the two prefaces and make easier the transition. Some such addition we should expect under these circumstances.

The sections 32:11-16, 34 must have been originally preceded by a superscription similar to v. 6. This supposition raises a further question. Is it probable that the Second Wise Man also bore the name of Elihu? If such were the case, the polemic must have been written after the Elihu Speeches had become known in connection with Job and the name already current was adopted to secure a hearing for the later contribution. The combination of the two at a later time would then be a foregone conclusion.

Since chap. 34, however, is not especially directed against the Elihu Speeches but rather denounces the work of the earlier poet, it was probably composed quite independently of them. In that case this polemic was perhaps headed by another name, which the editor saw fit to discard in favor of Elihu. It is not impossible that the phrase "of the tribe of Ram" in the prose introduction is a remnant of the title of the Second Wise Man.

The attempt has already been made to characterize his contribution, which we have sought to reconstruct. It represents not a supplement to the Elihu Speeches but another criticism on the Job controversy, conceived in a different temper—another outcome of the discussion which the boldness of the poem could not have failed to arouse. Whether written at the same time as the Elihu Speeches or at a somewhat later date, it would be difficult to determine. It appears probable that the more personal reply to Job was issued first and the polemic arraignment to the Wise Men somewhat later.

There are perhaps fewer Aramaisms in chap. 34 than the other sections exhibit; as poetry it is stronger and less halting—with the possible exception of chap. 37. Both writers employ the prevailing meter of the poem; both are in the wider sense Wise Men, who write after the manner of the Wisdom literature. The author of chap. 34 shows especially the influence of the Wise Men's manner of debate. The original poem had been carefully studied by both and is quoted with considerable accuracy; such references are usually noted in connection with the text.

THE OMISSIONS OF THE LXX TEXT

The second intricate problem to be considered in an examination of the text of the Elihu Speeches is that of the verses omitted by the

original form of the Greek text of the LXX. The unique importance of the LXX translation is recognized by all Old Testament scholars. In the criticism of Jeremiah the large omissions of the LXX have been accepted as evidence of later insertions in the work. In regard to Job, however, peculiar suspicion of the worth of its testimony has been entertained, especially with reference to the omissions of considerable sections which are found in the Hebrew text. Up to the present time only Bickell¹ and Hatch² among scholars have accepted the form of the text in the LXX as an earlier form of the text. The omissions are not confined to the Elihu Speeches but, as is well known, those of any considerable extent are more frequent here than in any other portion of the book.

Origen³ in the Epistle to Africanus bears testimony to the omissions of the Greek text of his time. He found verses of the Hebrew lacking in the LXX to the number of three or four, sometimes even fourteen or nineteen verses. The total number of missing verses he estimated as four hundred. In his edition of the Hexapla Origen supplied these deficiencies from the Greek translation of Theodotion and marked the insertions with asterisks. The following Greek MSS have preserved the Hexaplaric marks: (1) Cod. Colbertinus, MS 1952 in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris; (2) Cod. Vaticanus 346, numbered by Holmes and Parsons 248.

These two manuscripts are mentioned by Hatch, Dillmann,⁴ and others in the discussion of the LXX omissions, but they appear to have overlooked the fact that Codex Alexandrinus, an uncial Greek manuscript in the British Museum, also bears traces of the Hexaplaric asterisks. This codex was collated for Holmes and Parsons and noted with MS 248 as showing the asterisks. According to the evidence of these editors the Codex Alexandrinus confirms the fact of omission in the majority of cases where it is evidenced by the other witnesses to the early Greek text.

It has been possible to examine this manuscript only in the facsimile published by the British Museum. This examination, however, establishes beyond question the fact that the codex bore the

¹ *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* (1892), pp. 137 ff., 241 ff., 327 ff.; (1893), pp. 1 ff., 153 ff.

² *Essays in Biblical Greek*, pp. 215 f.

³ *Origen Op.* ed. Delarue, Vol. I, p. 15.

⁴ *Sitzungsberichte der kgl. Akademie zu Berlin* (1890), Bd. II, S. 1345.

asterisks. In regard to the larger omissions, which will be later considered, it is in each case possible to confirm the fact of omission, though the limits of such omission are sometimes difficult to determine, owing to the faintness of the marginal indications. The evidence of the manuscript is quoted where the writer's observations tended to confirm the witness of Holmes and Parsons and in a few other instances. It is, at all events, necessary to include Codex Alexandrinus as an important witness to the omissions of the early LXX text.

Jerome¹ translated the poem of Job into Latin and employed Origen's asterisks. In the preface to his edition of Job he states that he has added missing verses to the number of 700 or 800. Two Latin MSS preserve the asterisks: (1) a MS of the Bodleian (Cod. Lat. 2426) containing the Old Latin version and Jerome's translation; (2) a MS of the Monastery of Marmoutiers (published by Sabatier in *Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinae Versiones Antiquae*). Origen's Hexaplaric marks are also found in the Syriac Hexapla as represented by a MS of the Ambrosian Library at Milan.

Finally in 1883 Ciasca² discovered in the Museum Borgianum at Rome a Coptic-Sahidic version of Job which lacks substantially the sections indicated by the asterisks of Origen's Hexapla.

These witnesses agree as to many small and some larger omissions of the early LXX text. The testimony establishes the fact of omission at certain points though the limits are often variously fixed. In estimating the value of their combined evidence, certain considerations must be borne in mind.

1. There are instances in which Origen has obviously failed to recognize the Greek of the LXX as a translation of the MT and has supplied what is in reality a duplicate translation from Theodotion; e.g., 36:28b, 33; 37:1, 12. Occasionally he has assumed that a Greek verse represented a certain Hebrew text to which it bears only a superficial resemblance, e.g., 36:12, 17.

2. Great possibilities of error are inherent in this system of asterisks. The mark might easily be supposed to refer to an entire couplet when but one line was really omitted or vice versa. In transmission the asterisks might be misplaced or lost altogether.

¹ *Praefatio in Job*, IX (1097).

² Published in *Sacrorum Bibliorum Fragmenta Copto-Sahidica*, Vol. II.

For these reasons the Sahidic version furnishes an invaluable check on the evidence furnished by the Greek and Latin manuscripts, since it represents the form of the LXX text before the insertions were made by Origen. The Sahidic occasionally retains a verse or line which the Hexaplaric marks indicate as omitted or omits something which they retain. There is, however, a surprising agreement between the testimony of the Syriac Hexapla and the Sahidic. In general, it is hardly safe to trust the evidence of any single one of these groups of authorities—the Greek or Latin manuscripts, the Syriac Hexapla, or the Sahidic—in determining the question of an omission.

When the limits of the primitive LXX text have been determined with some degree of accuracy, there are still reservations to be made before accepting it as a witness to the early forms of the Hebrew text. Certain well-defined tendencies of the LXX translation become manifest in a study of the omitted passages of the chapters under discussion.

1. The LXX often omits or condenses what appears mere repetition in altered form of an idea previously expressed. This may apply to a phrase (e.g., 33:14; 34:22); to the second member of a parallel verse structure (e.g., 33:8*a*; 33:20*b*); to a verse or more which restates a thought in altered form for emphasis (e.g., 33:32, 33); to quotations from other portions of the poem whether verbal or somewhat less exact (34:3, 7). The recognition of such a tendency on the part of the LXX translator affords the most natural explanation for the omission of such verses or parts of verses as those indicated above. Interpreted as glosses they would be purposeless, and the quotations from the dialogue are usually essential to the argument.

Such a tendency would naturally have a disastrous effect on the translation of a Hebrew poem, the character of which depends so largely on balanced structure and the emphasis of repetition. Its workings are, however, to be detected in many cases by comparison with the verse structure of the Hebrew. Elsewhere, if this motive for omission furnishes a reasonable explanation, it is safer usually to retain the Hebrew text.

2. The LXX has made occasional omissions of a difficult line or verse of the Hebrew (e.g., 36:19; 37:18). Whether this explana-

tion may be assumed for a passage of several verses is doubtful. In such cases the translator appears to have adapted or altered, sometimes to have mistranslated, but seldom to have omitted entirely.

3. The Greek translator of Job—or translators as the case may be—has been accused of omitting portions repugnant to his religious sense or Hellenic taste. In view of the quite irreproachable theology of the Elihu Speeches this motive for omission would not be in evidence here; it would be difficult to point out an instance where it appears probable. Much which Elihu says must have offended a really delicate Hellenic sense, but the omitted passages are seldom more open to this somewhat vague charge than others quite faithfully reproduced.

These tendencies have hardly been sufficiently regarded by the two scholars who have accepted the witness of the LXX to an earlier form of the Hebrew text. Hatch, who was primarily a Greek scholar, seems to have confined himself too closely to the study of the Greek text without sufficiently considering the structure and thought of the original Hebrew. Moreover he has occasionally accepted the widest possible limits for an insertion and has not rigorously employed the corrective of the balance of evidence.

Dillmann¹ subjected Hatch's results to a searching criticism in which he has undoubtedly exposed many weak points in the argument and shown that the LXX omissions can often be explained by arbitrary motives. But his conclusion that all the omissions are to be accounted for in this way is too sweeping. Dillmann's verdict was indorsed by Driver,² though with less positiveness.

Bickell became convinced by the publication of the Sahidic version that the evidence of the LXX text was of supreme importance. His edition of Job³ follows the LXX closely in both large and small omissions—occasionally when the parallel verse structure or continuity of thought is obviously destroyed. He has also a special strophical and metrical theory which necessitates some omissions other than those indicated by the LXX text.

If the treatment of Hatch or Bickell is adopted in its entirety, it supposes a very active redactor of the poem responsible for many

¹ *Sitzungsberichte der kgl. Akademie zu Berlin* (1890), Bd. II, S. 1345.

² *The Contemporary Review* (1896), pp. 257 f.

³ *Das Buch Hiob* (1894).

small glosses and numerous larger additions of varied character and excellence or innumerable corrections and additions by many hands after the time of the Greek translation.

The conclusion from the evidence can hardly be summarized in a sentence to the effect that the passages omitted by the LXX do or do not constitute a part of the original Hebrew text. Each case must be judged for itself, in accordance with whatever canons of criticism a study of the material may enable one to establish. As has already been stated, the briefer omissions may usually be explained by some of the tendencies of the translator.

This explanation is, however, neither satisfying nor adequate for the larger connected sections omitted in 34:28-33; 36:7-17; 36:26-37:14. It becomes necessary in these cases to inquire whether the hypothesis of an interpolation in the Hebrew, after the first LXX translation, is not more in accord with internal probability and the textual evidence. A study of the omitted verses in the section 36:26-37:14 affords the clearest demonstration that such an addition has taken place, and this section will therefore be considered first. The actual evidence of the manuscripts, together with the suggestion of various scholars, is given in the notes on the text.

36:26-37:14.—The general theme of this section is easily stated—the greatness and wisdom of God as revealed in some of the phenomena of Nature. On closer examination the passage presents a decidedly confused and disconnected description of a rainstorm and of the approach of winter, heralded by snow and ice. Of this account 36:33 in its present form is quite unintelligible and the transitions from the thunderstorm to the snowfall and again in 37:11 to the lightning are, to say the least, sudden. The interruption between the lightning and the swift-following thunder caused by the verses 36:33, 37:1 is very awkward. Without constant reference to the Hebrew text, it would be impossible to make clear the puzzling lack of antecedent in some instances or the remarkable construction which must be assumed in some verses. Hoffmann, Siegfried, Budde, and Duhm have resorted to various radical emendations in an attempt to improve the sequence and construction of the verses in question.

Yet the description might pass as a whole in spite of its manifest weakness were it not for the strong external evidence to the contrary.

This evidence may be summarized as follows: the LXX supported by the Sahidic and Syriac Hexapla omitted several of these verses (36:26, 27*b*, 28*a*, 29–32; 37:2–5*a*, 6*b*–11, 12*ab*, 13)—verses which, standing alone, develop one theme consistently and the omission of which leaves the text far clearer and more intelligible. In the face of this evidence the probability of an interpolation becomes considerable. The following division adheres almost without exception to the outlines suggested by a careful comparison of the omitted sections in the three Greek and the Latin manuscripts, the Syriac Hexapla, and the Sahidic version.

V. 26 of chap. 36, omitted by all these witnesses, forms presumably the starting-point for the insertion. Of the next two verses it is evident that line *b* of v. 27 and line *a* of v. 28 did not stand in the LXX text. They might have been omitted as superfluous, but with a slight text emendation, supported by the Syriac and Vulgate, they form an excellent independent verse structure. In the same way v. 27*a* and v. 28*b* (LXX, Sah. text) compose a good intelligible couplet.

27*b* He poureth out the rain as His mist,
 28*a* Which the skies drop down from above.
 27*a* For He restraineth the drops of the water,
 28*b* Makes His cloud to o'ershadow many men.

Though these verses are at least as well balanced and readable as the present text there would seem no necessity for division, were it not for the evidence of the verses which follow. Vv. 29–32, of which the LXX apparently had not a trace, continue after vv. 27*b*, 28*a* a description of the rainstorm; this is curiously interrupted by 36:33; 37:1.

The asterisks indicate that these verses (36:33; 37:1) were lacking in the LXX, but a closer examination shows that both the Greek and the Sahidic texts read them. After v. 28 are found in the Sahidic and Syriac Hexapla, the Gk. MSS B. Alex. Colb. Vat. (248) and nine other cursives, two verses, which were supposedly not in the Hebrew text. Dillmann, Hatch, Bickell, and Duhm have, however, recognized that the second of these verses represents the Hebrew of 37:1. (For the Gk. and Heb. text, cf. the notes on the text of these verses.) The possibility is thus suggested that the former

verse may represent the Hebrew verse which precedes 37:1—that is 36:33. In its present unintelligible form, the Hebrew appears unlike the Greek, but without violent alteration it could be reconstructed to read as follows:

He appointeth a season for the cattle;
They know the place of their lying down.

This certainly represents the Greek rendering, is not far removed from the radicals of the Hebrew text, and gives an intelligible and appropriate reading. It must be remembered that if these verses (36:33; 37:1) stood in a wrong context in the Hebrew, considerable corruption might ensue to make them readable after 36:32. On the other hand, it would be strange if the Greek translator had invented a verse so like the Hebrew and yet so much more intelligible and appropriate. These verses should, then, follow v. 28*b* in the original text.

A further evidence for their proper position remains. MS C of the Greek and twenty-one cursives read these verses after 37:5*a*, followed by v. 5*b*. Now if we omit the verses which the LXX actually lacked (36:29–32; 37:2–5*a*), the verses under discussion (36:33; 37:1) are found in the same position in both groups of Greek manuscripts, the Syriac Hexapla, and the Sahidic—namely after 36:28*b* and preceding 37:5*b*. The verse sequence is then perfectly acceptable and natural.

- 27*a* For He restraineth the drops of the water,
- 28*b* Makes His cloud to o'ershadow many men.
- 33 He appointeth a season for the cattle;
They know the place of their lying down.
- 37:1 At this is not thy heart stirred,
And leapeth it not within thee?
- 5*b* Great things He worketh,—we know Him not;
- 6*a* For He saith to the snow, "Fall earthward."

The foregoing verses say nothing of the rainstorm, while the omitted sections give a connected and vivid description of one. Is it probable that this is mere coincidence?

The division is equally clear in the verses which follow. As it stands 37:4*c* has no proper conclusion, "He stayeth them not when His voice is heard." The "them" has no logical antecedent nor

following explanation, but if the next half-line¹ of the insertion v. 6*b* is read after it, the construction and thought are admirable.

He stayeth not, when His voice is heard,
The rain and His mighty storm.

V. 6*b* in its present position follows very curiously upon v. 6*a*.

The gathering rainstorm is well portrayed in the verses of the insertion—the clouds (36:29, 30), the lightning (36:32), the thunder (37:2–4) and at last the sharp, fierce, downpour of the rain (37:4*c*, 6*b*).

V. 7² should undoubtedly follow v. 6*b*. It is the snow, and not the rain, which sets a seal upon men's work and leads them to ponder the wonder of God's way. The phrase is very apt when one remembers how a great snowstorm hinders the customary activity of men. V. 8 tells of its effect on the wild animals, vv. 9, 10 of the coming of cold and ice.

With vv. 11–12*b*, which the best witnesses for the LXX text omit, the theme is again the rainstorm of which vv. 7–10 have been silent. V. 12 with the exception of the last clause is indicated by asterisks in some forms of the Greek, but the present LXX has a duplicate translation of v. 12*c* and it is also read by the Sahidic. Only v. 12*a*, *b*, referring to the lightning and cloud of v. 11, should, therefore, be included with the insertion. This couplet followed by v. 13 furnishes a fitting conclusion to the poem of the rainstorm.

12*a* And is turned about on every side,
To work according to His wisdom,—
13 Whether for judgment on His land,
Or if in mercy He send it.

V. 12*c*, *d*, also forms a good couplet, which summarizes the preceding verses of the original text, and introduces the exhortation to Job in v. 14.

12*c* All these things He hath commanded them,
12*d* On the widespread face of the earth.
14 Hear this, Oh Job, and give pause;
Ponder the marvels of God.

If the lines of division suggested by the external evidence are followed, two distinct and independent conceptions are to be distinguished in the section 36:26–37:14. The verses omitted in the

¹ V. 5*a* is probably a gloss on v. 4*b*. Cf. notes on text

² Cf. notes on text.

primitive LXX compose a Psalm of a Thunderstorm—God's mighty instrument of blessing or punishment; there is no allusion to Job or to other phenomena of nature. The argument of Elihu freed from the interwoven verses becomes far clearer. God's providence is shown forth by the overhanging clouds, by His care for the dumb cattle and the wonders of the snow and ice. A similar thought is developed in Ps. 147:8 f.

After v. 13 only one verse is omitted by the LXX witnesses in the remainder of the chapter. On a theory of arbitrary omission, it would be remarkable that the section 36:26—37:14 should have been so radically abbreviated and the following section left almost untouched. Nothing in the character of the omitted verses, linguistic or religious, suggests a reason for such a procedure. The mere supposition that the LXX translators wished to relieve the poem of undue length cannot account for the phenomenon of so consistent and independent an omission.

The strongest argument for the probability of an insertion is to be drawn from the vicissitudes of the verses 36:33; 37:1. No theory of omission will explain satisfactorily their present position in the text, that in the Sahidic and some Greek MSS after 36:28, in others a place after 37:5*a*. In the interweaving of the two texts the verses were inserted where they now stand and became corrupted. Origen failed to recognize that the Hebrew verses were represented in the Greek and supplied a duplicate translation from Theodotion, allowing the Greek verses to retain their original position after v. 28*b*. In other Greek manuscripts when the insertion was made from Theodotion, the connection of these verses (36:33; 37:1) with 37:5*b* was retained and the insertion was introduced before instead of after them.

Bickell has followed the outlines of this division in most cases, but by reading the MT in 36:33 he loses the clearness of the distinction. He has also retained parts of 37:11, 12 which belong with the insertion, and he has not attempted to reconstruct the inserted poem. Hatch suggested that in the section 36:22—37:13 four poems—two original and two added—had been fused together. The theory is open to Dillmann's criticism, that it is far too artificial.

A motive for the insertion of the Psalm of the Rainstorm is not

far to seek. Elihu's argument was drawn from the wonders of creation, and the psalm was in entire harmony. 36:27*a* perhaps gave the immediate suggestion for insertion. The title, Psalm of the Rainstorm, has been employed for this poem because of its likeness to the psalm character in the religious interpretation of nature. A similar theme is developed in Ps. 107:33-37. The saving mercy of the rain upon a hot, dry land might well inspire a psalm of thanksgiving, even as the terror of the lightning would suggest swift divine judgment. The poem as a whole is printed below in order to show its continuity and the consistency of its theme.

- 36:26 Lo, God is exalted, we know Him not;
 The number of His years is unsearchable.
 27 He poureth out the rain as His mist,
 28*a* Which the skies drop down from above.
 29 Who can know the spreading of the cloud,
 The thunderings of His pavilion?
 30 Lo, about Him He spreadeth the cloud,
 And He covereth the tops of the mountains.
 31 For thus He judgeth the peoples;
 Yea, and gives food in abundance.
 32 About His hands He wrappeth the lightning,
 He directeth it unto its goal.
 37:2 Hark now, and hear the rumbling of His voice,
 The muttering that goeth forth from His mouth.
 3 Under all the heavens He sendeth it forth,
 His lightning upon the ends of the earth.
 4 And after it roareth a voice,—
 He thundereth with the voice of His majesty.
 He stayeth not, when His voice is heard,
 6*b* The rain and His mighty storm.
 11 Yea, He ladeth the thick cloud with lightning;
 The cloud scattereth forth His light,
 12*a* And is turned about on every side,
 b To work according to His wisdom,—
 13 Whether for judgment on His land
 Or if in mercy He send it.

34:28-33.—External and internal evidence unite to demonstrate the fact of an interpolation in 36:25—37:14. In regard to the omitted sections in 34:28-33 and 36:7-17 the matter is less clear.

In 34:28-33 six continuous verses are shown by all the chief witnesses to have been omitted in the early form of the LXX text. The question again arises as to whether the omission may be due to the difficulty of the text or its reiteration of earlier statements. There are, it is true, problems of interpretation in vv. 31-33, but the actual translation need not have offered exceptional difficulty. Theodotion and the other versions render the verses with a considerable degree of accuracy. On the other hand, the thought of the passage is quite distinct from what has preceded. It introduces the national disaster of the reign of an evil king—a decidedly new thought.

If there appears no obvious reason for so extensive an omission at this point, certain indications lead us to question the place of these verses in the context. The connection between v. 28 and v. 27 or v. 26 is very strange.

- 27 For that they turned from following Him,
Unto all His ways gave no heed.
28 To bring unto Him the cry of the poor,
And the cry of the needy He heareth.

The sequence is not greatly improved if, with Budde, Duhm, and Beer, v. 27 is omitted as a gloss. V. 26 reads:

- He crusheth and dismayeth the wicked;
In the sight of men's eyes doth He smite them.

V. 28 follows strangely on this. Must God then destroy the wicked before the cry of the poor and needy can reach him? The versions, moreover, offer no support for the omission of v. 27. The transition at the end of the section is no better. After v. 27, which summarizes the account of God's visitations on the wicked, would follow most naturally the judgment on Job in vv. 34-37. The arrangement already suggested, whereby 34:27 is followed by 35:15, 16 and 34:33-37, furnishes a far more appropriate conclusion to the chapter. It cannot, however, be affirmed on that ground that the verses might not have formed a part of the Elihu sections. The evidence only indicates that the passage appears out of place in the charge against Job and that the arbitrary omission of this unbroken section is more difficult to explain than its

insertion. A final decision on this case is only possible after a consideration of the omission in 36:6-17.

36:7b-9, 10a-13, 16, 17.—The asterisks in this section indicate that the LXX translation lacked the vv. 5b-9, 10b, c, 11, 13, 16. It has however been recognized by various scholars—Bickell, Dillmann, Budde, Duhm—that the LXX text of vv. 12a, 15, 17 shows traces of the Hebrew text through v. 7a. This conclusion is borne out by the evidence of the Sahidic text. Duhm remarks in this connection, “Uebrigens fehlen die nächsten fünf Disticha 7b-11 in der ursprünglichen LXX und es ist nicht unmöglich, dass Hatch und Bickell mit ihrer Streichung im Recht sind, doch würde ich ihnen eher folgen, wenn LXX entweder v. 11 hätte oder auch v. 12 vermissen liesse.”

There are two objections to be raised to this statement: (1) The LXX undoubtedly read v. 10a, as the asterisks and the Sahidic text indicate. (2) V. 12 of the LXX cannot represent v. 12 of the Hebrew text which, therefore, belongs with the omitted verses, 10b-13. (Cf. notes on text of v. 12.) Undoubtedly vv. 11, 12 of the present text complement each other and if one of them stood in the original text, the evidence for an insertion would be greatly weakened.

What the Greek v. 12—supported by the Sahidic and a quotation in Clement of Alexandria (Strom. 4. 26, p. 641)—actually represents is an exact translation of the Heb. v. 6a, followed by a couplet not found in the Hebrew. (For the Greek text and its Hebrew equivalent cf. the notes on the text.) The Hebrew represented may be translated as follows:

For they seek not the knowledge of the Lord;
And chastened, they yet hearken not.

The Greek of v. 12 cannot be regarded even as a free translation of the Massoretic text, but a not too close observer in comparing texts might suppose that it represented the Hebrew because of one similar phrase. The verse would, in consequence, remain without asterisks, though it obviously belongs with the insertion in vv. 7b-9, 10b-13, 16.

When the real limits of the omission have been recognized, the problem is scarcely less puzzling. If the LXX translators are responsible for the discrepancies between the Greek and Hebrew texts, grave charges are to be laid at their door. They not only, on this supposition, omitted eighteen lines from a possible thirty

in vv. 7b-17, but they placed v. 6a before v. 12, which they altered beyond recognition, v. 7a after v. 15, and v. 7b after v. 16. Do we find elsewhere such curiously violent treatment of the Hebrew at the hands of its Greek translators?

A reasonable motive for such a procedure is difficult to find. The diction of the passage is unusually prosaic but, with the exception of v. 16, not obscure. Neither is there anything objectionable from a religious point of view. The verses have, indeed, a more general reference than most of Elihu's words, with no particular allusion to Job's case. But if the LXX translators merely saw fit to abbreviate the poem here, it is curious that they so unnecessarily violated its order. Vv. 6 and 7a might have retained their present position and been followed by v. 10a. The procedure appears more like that of an interpolator than of a translator who held his text in any degree of respect.

A further test may be applied to discover whether the remaining verses, read in the order of the Greek, form a clearer, more intelligible argument. The LXX evidently read the entire v. 5 but condensed it somewhat. This was followed by a verse consisting of v. 10a and v. 6a (=Gk. v. 12a). It is obvious that v. 6a in the present Gk. text is a duplicate translation from Theodotion of the line which occurs in the LXX before v. 12. Verse 12, according to the Greek, should be followed by vv. 14, 15. In the LXX of v. 15b is recognizable the Hebrew v. 6b and in v. 17 of the Greek, v. 7a of the Hebrew. Elihu's argument would then be as follows:

- | | |
|----------|---|
| 5 | Lo, God is mighty in strength;
Rejecteth not the pure of heart. |
| 10a | Through chastening He openeth their ear, |
| 6a | But he granteth not life to the wicked. |
| 12 (LXX) | For they seek not the knowledge of the Lord;
And chastened, they yet hearken not. |
| 14 | Their soul perisheth in youth,
Their life like to the unclean. |
| 15 | But the afflicted by affliction He delivereth,
Through suffering He openeth his ear. |
| 6b | Judgment for the oppressed He giveth;
From the just withholdeth not justice. |
| 18 | Let not wrath stir thee against chastening,
Greatness of ransom turn away thy heart. |

By the omission of the obelized verses, the development of the thought does not lose in force and certainly gains infinitely in clearness.

Beginning with the antithetic parallelism in v. 5 the passage contrasts God's dealing with the wicked and with those whom He would save through affliction and chastening. Vv. 18, 19, 21 convey the warning which this lesson should bring to Job. "Be not rebellious against the suffering God inflicts. Become not as the wicked." The thought is clearly the one most characteristic of Elihu, more directly expressed than in chap. 33. Dillmann has declared that after the omission of the obelized verses Elihu's *Leidenzucht* teaching is no longer recognizable. We cannot escape the impression that it is far more consistently and clearly developed than in the present form of the text and nothing of the argument for Job's case is lost. It is possible to read the chapter as it stands and win a fairly intelligible sense, but it gains infinitely when the LXX text is followed. Is it justifiable to assert that this desirable result is due to the literary taste of the LXX translators?

Dillmann has further stated that it would take a magician to reconstruct the Hebrew text from the Greek but the latter may easily be understood as a free reworking of the Hebrew. The statement is hardly accurate. In the verses which the LXX reads, it reproduces the corresponding Hebrew with considerable accuracy. Only one verse of its text (v. 12) has apparently been replaced by one of the insertion. The order of the verses, as shown by the Sahidic, appears very natural. The easier hypothesis is really that of an interpolator.

The couplet vv. 10a, 6a was divided and combined at two different points with the insertion; the verse 6b, 7a was shifted to a position before the insertion to make place for vv. 16, 17. The main section vv. 7b-9, 10b-13 was then added, interrupted only by the employment of v. 10a, and the original v. 12 was either dropped at this time or later identified with the present v. 12. After vv. 14, 15 the interpolator restored connection with the context by the addition of vv. 16, 17 referring to Job. The process of rearrangement is not remarkably complicated for an interpolator but an equal amount of alteration by a Greek translator is almost unexplainable, since the meaning of the Hebrew text has not been wrested.

It remains to consider the character and continuity of the omitted verses (7b-9, 10b-13). They form seven quite regular, though very unpoetic, couplets and, read consecutively, picture the fate of evil kings. When God punishes their wickedness and commands obedience, the choice of repentance and happiness or a dreadful end in their folly and hardness of heart, is before them. Into Elihu's argument from God's dealing with the wicked and the suffering righteous, they bring the thought of the fortune of royal evil-doers. It is not altogether out of harmony with the general theme but it has no real significance for Job's problem. Says Duhm, "Das (v. 4) wird gleich im Folgenden an einem Beispiel weiter entwickelt, das wirklich 'von weit her' aus hohen Regionen geholt ist und seinem pathetischen Geschmack entspricht; er [Elihu] redet von Königen ebenso oft wie der Dichter Hiobs selten."

If this section be compared with 34:28-33 a remarkable similarity of thought is to be observed. In chap. 34 it is also a question of God's mysterious providence, "when he setteth a godless man as king," and of the repentance such a man should show (v. 31). Duhm suggests also a relation between the two sections. 34:33 again adds an afterthought for Job; 34:33 and 36:16,17 are not unlike in tone.

If the two sections are really later insertions, might we not hit upon an explanation for their addition in their common political reference? It is possible that it may not have been Elihu who was so given to royal illustrations. The single mention of a king elsewhere (34:18) is quite incidental. Might not these two prosaic and inappropriate amplifications of Elihu's theme have been added at a time when hated and evil kings were the chief affliction to be endured by the people of God? At such a time a later reader might have been moved to insert these references to national calamities, since the poem so conspicuously ignored this phase of the problem. Even the reign of a wicked king over the nation is to be accepted as a part of the divine order.

If He be silent who shall condemn?
If He hide His face, who then shall chide Him?
Alike with a man or a nation,
When He setteth a godless man as king, etc.

But let such a king show repentance toward God or await the hapless reward of his folly.

But if not, they pass unto Sheol,
And without knowledge, they perish.

A period which might have suggested an interpolation of this kind would be that of Antiochus Epiphanes. The most natural explanation of a reference to an evil king in later Jewish literature is to connect it with this bitterly hated monarch. But the tone of the remarks is perhaps a milder one than that time of fierce hatred and despair would have produced. The Book of Daniel shows how the stress of that period found definite literary expression.

Another somewhat less hated ruler of the Jews who might suggest himself is Ptolemy Philopator—Ptolemy IV. He reversed the kindly policy which his predecessors had adopted toward the Jews and incurred their hatred, according to the Third Book of Maccabees, by attempting to force his way into the temple. Whatever may be thought of the historical worth of this narrative, it at any rate bears witness to a very strong prejudice among the Jews against this degenerate descendant of the Ptolemies. His persecution of the Jews of Alexandria is a matter of history. The character of these interpolations might indicate an allusion to his reign (222–205 B.C.); he is probably alluded to in Ecclesiastes 4:13 in a manner which would support such a hypothesis: "Better is a youth poor and wise than a king old and foolish, who no longer knows how to be admonished."¹

The political reference is, however, too general to be referred with certainty to a special period of late Jewish history. More than one reign would have justified the attitude of the writer regarding the affliction of an evil king and might have suggested such additions to a book which professed to consider the problem of evil and the divine government of the universe.

The evidence of the LXX, the special and peculiar character of the two sections, in thought and to some extent in form, make it probable that they are later interpolations; the improvement in the text, resulting from their omission, strengthens this probability. Though the evidence is not so unmistakable as in 36:26—37:14, the hypothesis of interpolation furnishes a more satisfactory explana-

¹ Cf. Barton, *Ecclesiastes* (1908), p. 61.

tion of these passages than that of arbitrary omission. Moreover, the confirmation of the LXX testimony in regard to one of the so-called omissions must necessarily strengthen confidence in its witness to similar large omissions. Finally, if these verses (34:28-33; 36:7b-9, 10b-13, 16, 17) were interpolated, the suggestion of their political bearing would offer a reasonable motive for their insertion.

Though they do not properly fall within the scope of this discussion it seems best to consider briefly the larger omissions which the Greek text shows in the remainder of the poem. Of connected omissions, including five or more verses, which are comparable with those discussed above there are three: 21:28-33; 26:5-11; 28:14-19.

28:14-19.—The praise of Wisdom in chap. 28 is quite generally conceded to be a later addition to the poem. Nevertheless vv. 14-19 (omitted by Codd. Alex. Vat. Colb. Marm. and the Syr. Hex. and Sahidic) stamp themselves as a secondary insertion. Budde, who regards the chapter as genuine, omits vv. 15-20 as a gloss; Dillmann agrees that here the LXX omission coincides with a real interpolation in the text. Vv. 15-19 interrupt the thought of the unattainableness of Wisdom with the conventional praise of her value (cf. Prov. 3:14, 15; 8:10, 11, 19). The section is almost certainly a bit of later expansion.

The likeness between v. 12 and v. 20 seems to Budde and Dillmann indicative of a duplication of v. 12 to restore the connection before v. 21. They therefore conclude that the LXX translator read the present text and has not maintained the limits of the insertion in its omission. It does not, however, appear improbable that v. 20 may have stood in the original text after v. 13 to emphasize the question. Dillmann explains the LXX omission as due to distaste for the enumeration of these strange valuables or to the presence of signs in the Hebrew exemplar which indicated that the section had been added. The latter hypothesis may furnish the easiest explanation of the omission, but if the possibility of such indications of addition is admitted here, it could not be excluded elsewhere, if internal evidence were in favor of it.

26:5-11.—The problem in 26:5-11 is more complicated. Reuss, Siegfried, Bickell, Duhm, and others believe that the section 26:5-11

is misplaced; Grill and Laue regard the verses as part of an interpolation at this point. It is safe to say that the majority of recent critics believe there has been radical readjustment of the text in the chapters following chap. 24. If 26:5-11 are omitted the connection between 26:4 and 26-12 is not good, as Dillmann has remarked. But if the verses after 26:4 should be connected with 25:1-6, as seems most probable, the Hebrew exemplar employed by the translator may have indicated such disorder of the text or possibly omitted the verses at this point. Without entering upon a very complicated process of rearrangement, it may be affirmed that the LXX omission at this point was probably motived by the disorder and confusion of its exemplar.

21:28-33.—The omission of 21:28-33 is more difficult of explanation. The connection would be excellent between v. 27 and v. 34, and the verses omitted are not essential to the thought. On the other hand, they are in general harmony with the thought of the chapter and have neither the style nor the character which would suggest an interpolation. It may be in this case that the usual explanation will suffice and that the LXX translator, perhaps because of the boldness of the chapter, chose to omit a part of it.

The omissions in chap. 26 and chap. 28 support a belief that the LXX testimony is to be valued as evidence for an earlier form of the Hebrew text. That a larger proportion of such late interpolations is found in the Elihu Speeches than in the remainder of the poem is not strange. Elihu appeared to later Jewish readers the hero of the poem; he answered Job when the friends had failed. His more commonplace theory appealed to the mind of the ordinary reader and afforded a point of contact for additions, while the poorer style and looser construction of the chapters made it easier to supplement them.

More than one explanation for the testimony of the LXX to these insertions is possible.

1. There is the possibility which Dillmann has suggested that the LXX translator used an exemplar with indications of addition or disorder. This hypothesis is plausible in the case of 28:14-19 and 26:5-11. It is less satisfactory as an explanation for the inserted Psalm of the Rainstorm or the omission in 36:7b-17, where the interweaving of the texts is more complicated.

2. The insertions might have been made in certain Hebrew exemplars before the time of the LXX translation but not have been contained in the copy used by the LXX translator. When Theodotion made his translation they had found their way into all of the Hebrew texts.

3. The third possibility is that the additions were made to the Hebrew text after the time of the first LXX translation.

The probability of the last hypothesis would be largely affected by the dating of the LXX translation of Job. This question is an important one and has received considerable attention from scholars. The present discussion can do no more than suggest a possible date and some arguments to support it.

Graetz¹ endeavored to prove that the Greek translation of Job belonged to the first century A.D. and was no other than the translation condemned by Rabbi Gamaliel I (cf. Bab. Talmud Sab. 115a). This translation has usually been regarded by scholars as a Targum to Job and it is far more probable that such was the nature of the translation, since Targumim on the Hagiographa were forbidden.² The passage in the Babylonian Talmud reads plainly ספר איוב תרגום a phrase which would hardly be used of a Greek translation. Though the present Targum can hardly be the one referred to—Bacher dates it about 476—the numerous duplicate translations found in it may possibly suggest that another had already been in existence. Bacher surmises that the forbidden Targum on Job may have come from the hand of Jonathan ben Uzziel, who was supposed to have composed that on the prophets.

Nöldeke,³ in a review of Bickell's early work on the LXX translation of Job, fixes the *terminus ad quem* for the work at 150 B.C. He bases his conclusion on the witness of the fragment of Aristæas Περὶ Ἰουδαίων found in Eusebius. The outline of Job's history is there related, substantially as in the biblical narrative. Job is, however, identified with Jobab (Gen. 36:33) and thus made a descendant of Esau. The titles of the friends also appear as they do in the LXX supplement (42:17) though Elihu is here named with them.

¹ *Monatsschrift G.W.J.* (1877), p. 83.

² Cf. Bacher, art. "Targum" in *Jew. Enc.*

³ *Gött. Gelehrte Anzeigen* (1865), p. 579.

This supplement is almost certainly a later addition to the original LXX translation, and Freudenthal¹ believes the material for it was derived from Aristeas' history. It is at any rate clear that Aristeas knew the Greek translation of the poem proper. Nöldeke, in the belief that Aristeas also drew from the later supplement to the LXX, maintained that the translation of the book into Greek must have taken place before 150 B.C. If Freudenthal's opposite view is accepted, the evidence would only prove that the Greek translation of Job was in existence some time before 100 B.C.

The earlier date, favored by Nöldeke, has much in its favor. The translation of the Pentateuch and the Prophets had been accomplished before 150 B.C. Though the Hagiographa were held in less esteem and would be translated later, the statement in the Prologue of the younger Sira certainly implies that he knew a Greek form of some of the Hagiographa. The date of this prologue can be assigned with some certainty to the year 132 B.C., and if Job was among the books referred to, a date considerably earlier than this time would be established for the Greek translation of the poem.

The later books of the Greek Psalter are by Swete² assigned to the second half of the second century. The Greek Esther was already in circulation before the end of the second century. Eupolemus, who probably wrote about the middle of the second century, makes use of the Greek Chronicles. All of these books must have been written much later than Job, and it seems justifiable to infer that a translation of the poem would have preceded them, since the book very probably found more appreciation among Hellenists than among the Hebrews themselves.

The date of the Greek translation of Job cannot be positively fixed, but a strong probability that it belongs to a time before 150 B.C. is established. If the additions in 34:28-33 and 36:7-17 refer to conditions at the time of Ptolemy Philopator they could hardly have been composed after the time of the first LXX translation. But it is entirely possible that they had not before this time found their way into the exemplar employed by the LXX translator. If, as is possible, they refer to somewhat later periods of political stress,

¹ Alex. Polyhister, pp. 136-43, 231. Cf. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes* (3d ed.), III, 356.

² *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, pp. 24, 25.

their composition may have been subsequent to the original Greek translation of the poem. The Psalm of the Rainstorm had probably been in existence as an independent psalm some time before its combination with the Elihu Speeches, which may have occurred after the LXX translation.

For the omissions in 21:28-33; 26:5-11; 28:14-19 other explanations may be necessary, though 28:14-19 might easily be a late insertion; the verses contain nothing which a late glossator might not have written. The general opinion of the writer concerning the other two sections has already been stated, and they lie outside the limits of this discussion. To suggest the possibility of various explanations for these larger omissions of the LXX text may seem too complicated a solution. Really less credible, however, would be a theory which insisted that all of them, of whatever style or character, must have emanated from one redactor. Although it might seem simplest to explain these passages as arbitrary omissions of the LXX translator, the complicated nature of the evidence in several cases is very difficult to reconcile with such an explanation.

THE DATE OF THE ELIHU SPEECHES

The recognized inferiority of the Elihu Speeches and their peculiarities of language have usually led to the conclusion that they belonged to a far later period than the poem. Many scholars, as Stuhlmann, Hitzig, Bleek, who have believed the poem pre-exilic, have assigned to Elihu a post-exilic date. Others, among them Ewald, Dillmann, Duhm, place a century or two between the two compositions. The question is usually left somewhat indefinite with the statement that the Elihu Speeches form a later addition. Duhm dates Job in the first half of the fifth century and Elihu a few hundred years later. He mentions as reasons for postulating a long interval of time between the two compositions, the more developed conceptions of the physical universe in Elihu, a later form of angelology, and a probable reference to the Chronicler's tales of Manasseh and those of Nebuchadnezzar in Daniel.

The first of these arguments rests on somewhat insufficient evidence. The description of natural wonders in chaps. 36, 37 is far less vivid, less figurative—in a word less poetic than the Yahweh

Speeches, but that it shows any real change of attitude, any development of scientific knowledge, is difficult to discern. Chief stress is laid on 36:27, 28 in which the author supposedly states that the water is drawn up from the earth and distilled as rain. Even in its present form the text must be a little strained to give this meaning, and neither the LXX nor the Syriac supports the rendering. What should be read in vv. 27, 28 is as follows (cf. LXX and notes on the text):

- 27a He restraineth the drops of the water,
- 28b Makes his cloud to o'ershadow many men.
- 27b He poureth out the rain as His mist,
- 28a Which the skies drop down from above.

As a previous section of this discussion has attempted to prove, these verses are composite; the text is slightly corrupt and the entire Psalm of the Rainstorm must be recognized as an insertion. In the verses which are Elihu's, God's immediate activity in Nature and the mystery of his works seems recognized as in the Yahweh Speeches, though expressed in tamer language.

The significance of the angelology of Elihu can at least be over-emphasized. The phrase "the death bringers" in 33:22 is almost certainly a misreading, as shown by the versions (cf. note on 33:22). With Eichhorn among older critics, Volck, Knabenbauer, and Genung of the later, we believe that in the much-quoted passage 33:23 Elihu is referring to himself as the "interpreter." But even though מַלְאָכַי "angel" be retained, it is hardly justifiable to assume a much later date than that of the original poem on this evidence. Eliphaz in 5:1 has mentioned the "holy ones" upon whom Job might call. No great lapse of time is needed to account for the similar conception in 33:23, if indeed a supernatural agent be suggested by the passage.

A reference to the stories of Manasseh (II Chron. 33:10 f.) and Nebuchadnezzar, which Duhm finds in 36:7 f., is at best very uncertain, and these verses are among those which the LXX did not read. For their allusions to royal personages another explanation, already suggested, seems at least equally probable. These arguments, then, are insufficient to establish a long period of time between Job and its "first theological criticism." Other criteria of greater significance are those of the language and the religious attitude.

The relation of Elihu's teaching to that of the friends has already been discussed. Though the conception was not strange to the poet, it may, perhaps, have found a more sympathetic response in a later time and been further developed in the Elihu Speeches. Yet another writer, very soon after the writing of the poem, might have seized upon this special aspect of the problem which he felt was essential, and added it. The thought in itself need not indicate a much later development.

A very marked piety and excessive reverence, which characterize Elihu, would be not less explainable in a writer of the period after the P document than in one of a considerably later stage of Judaism. If Job is dated after Ezra, an attitude like that of Job's author and one like that of Elihu's are both perfectly possible. The two currents of thought—the bold, questioning tone of Job and a very devout, conventional piety—must have flourished side by side in the century after Ezra. Not all the Wise Men of Israel were so untrammelled and so daring as the poet of Job.

The witness of the language is more difficult to estimate. The larger proportion of Aramaisms in these chapters and the use of some few forms found only here have been discussed in a previous section of the introduction. These differences and the general usage of the writer stamp him as another than the original poet, but Budde's investigations show that the character of the diction is not radically different. The difference, in other words, cannot be sufficient to establish a long interval between the two. Certain stock phrases of the Wisdom vocabulary more common in Proverbs than in Job appear more frequently in these chapters, e.g., **יִסִּיר (דַּע) דַּעַת**, **הַכֶּם**. This might be indicative of a somewhat later date or only of the use of a more commonplace, stereotyped vocabulary. Wisdom represents with Elihu essentially what it represents in the poem. It is definitely a possession of the Wise Man and is not regarded as an independent and personified attribute. There is no trace of Greek influence in Elihu's thinking such as appears in Ben Sira.

The speeches in spite of their peculiar diction show no such admixture of New-Hebrew forms, Aramaic constructions, and foreign words as do Ecclesiastes and Ben Sira. There is perhaps a slight tendency to employ unusual Hiphils, which is very marked in Ben

Sira. In general, however, the diction of these chapters stands in far closer relationship to that of Job than to the late decadent Hebrew of Ecclesiastes and Ben Sira. It is interesting to note that Elihu's favorite phrase, בִּיטָר "chastisement," has come to mean in Sira "politeness," *Lebensart*.

The characteristics of Elihu, then, in language and type of thought, do not necessitate a date far removed from that of the poem. Kuenen has declared that the difference in age between the poem and its chief insertion is not sufficient to be determined. He believes the author of Elihu, though an inferior poet, may even have been a contemporary of the original author.

It must be admitted that the most natural supposition is that this supplement was added to the poem while it was still comparatively unknown. The book would hardly have circulated long in religious circles without some such addition. While the reaction against its daring was still strong and before its position through age and long use had become more assured, would be the most probable time for the addition of such a corrective supplement. Later interpolators would be more likely to attempt to soften Job's words, to bring him to repentance—in short to make more understandable his final justification by Yahweh. This is essentially the opinion of Hoffmann and Laue, who affirm that the general working over of the poem from chap. 24, which allowed Job to find the solution for himself, was not in the book when the Elihu sections were added. There was, therefore, more reason for such a corrective addition than the poem in its present form offers. Chap. 28 put into the mouth of Job renders the Elihu speeches quite superfluous.

But some time for this process must be allowed. The LXX translators had the text of the poem with these chief insertions before them. Ben Sira almost certainly knew the poem with the Elihu Speeches and chap. 28. He undoubtedly employs chap. 28 (cf. Sira 1) and in 18:13, 14 we believe there is an allusion to Elihu's redemptive theory, developed in 33:17-26. No tradition of the book has come down to us without the Elihu Speeches.

No distinction has been made, up to this point, between the two authors of the speeches. They cannot have been separated by a long period, though representing two different points of view regarding

the earlier book. One critic had a special and comparatively fresh theory to propound, the other harked back to the retribution teaching of the friends. The opinion has been already expressed that the first is the earlier and that chap. 34 may have been written at a slightly later date. But it would be futile to attempt closer distinctions.

The most probable hypothesis, then, is that the Elihu Speeches represent a combination of a criticism and a supplement of the Job poem written by two Wise Men of the first or, at latest, the second generation after the daring poet. To their well-meant efforts we no doubt owe the preservation of the poem.

Something should be said of the character who has given a name to the sections. His name, unlike those of the friends, is symbolic; Elihu, the son of Barachel, is a true Hebrew name—Elihu meaning "My God it is" and Barachel "God blesses" or "Bless God." The former name is found once in I Sam. 1, among the 'ancestors of Samuel, and three times in Chronicles (I Chron. 12:20; 26:7; 27:18), which probably indicates a preference for the name in post-exilic times. Barachel occurs nowhere else, though very like the frequent **בִּרְכִּיהוּ**. The theory that the author chose this opportunity to immortalize his own name is very doubtful in view of the character of the names and Hebrew literary traditions. Budde is probably right in suggesting that the names are chosen with reference to the character of the speeches.

The tribal designation "the Buzite" suggests the mention of Buz (Gen. 22:21), the son of Nahor and brother of Uz. This connection with the name of Job's supposed ancestor probably explains the choice of the title. In vv. 2-5 of the prose introduction, added by the combiner, one more designation is found—"of the tribe of Ram." The suggestion has already been offered that this might represent a fragment of the original title of the second Wise Man. Ram is found elsewhere in a genealogical table (I Chron. 2:9, 25, 27) as the name of a brother or son of Jerachmeel, an ancestor of David.

Hoffmann observes that the phrase **בוז בַּשְּׁפִירוֹת** "contempt of families" occurs in 31:34 and believes that it suggested a play on the phrase employing **רם** "exalted." The Buzite with this inter-

pretation would signify "the despised." Budde is inclined to accept the explanation but it appears somewhat fanciful. The Syriac translators render "of the tribe of Remmon," and the Targum reads, "from the family of Abraham." In the LXX we find added "from the land of Ausitis."

We may probably conclude that the introduction gives us nothing of significance beyond a suggestion of the purpose of Elihu's author.

TEXT OF THE ELIHU SPEECHES

CHAP. 32

Vv. 2-5. *Prose Introduction of the Editor*

2. Then the anger of Elihu, son of Barachel, the Buzite, of the tribe of Ram, was kindled; against Job his wrath was kindled, because he justified himself rather than God.

3. And against his three friends was his wrath kindled, because they had not found an answer and condemned Job.

4. But Elihu waited while they were speaking with Job, for they were older than he.

5. And Elihu saw that there was no answer in the mouth of these three men and his anger was kindled.

2. Vv. 2-5 form an awkward summary of Elihu's introduction in vv. 1, 6-10, 18-22 and of the introduction to chap. 34 found in chap. 32, vv. 11-16. Hoff. Budde omit vv. 2-5 as redactional. **רם ממשפחה** Syr. "of Remmen," Tar. "of Abraham." Sym. *Suplas*.

3. MT **וירשעו** LXX MS 23 **Α**^{c.c.} A* Syr. Hex. (marg.) rd. probably **ויצדיקו**, MT **את-איוב**. In Jewish tradition this is one of 18 Tikkun Sopherim for **האלהים** (so MS Ken. 683). But Hit. notes that Ibn Ezra did not share Jewish opinion.

4. MT **הכה את איוב בקררים** gives an impossible construction. LXX Vet. Lat "to give answer," Sym. Syr. **הקה**, Hit. **רעי** before **איוב**, Duhm **להשיב** before **את**. Trsp. probably and rd. with Wr. Budde **את איוב**. LXX Sah. om. vv. 4b-5 as superfluous.

THE ORIGINAL ELIHU SPEECHES

CHAP. 32

1. Now these three men ceased to answer Job, because he was righteous in their eyes.

.

1. MT **שלושת האנשים**; LXX **שלושת רעי**; MT Tar. Vul. **בעיניו**. Rd. probably with MS Ken. 248. LXX Sym. Syr. Hex. (marg.) **בעיניהם**. The verse was probably altered to accord with vv. 2-5. Note that the prose has poetical accentuation here.

2. Vv. 2-5 are omitted here as work of compiler. Hoff. and Budde omit.

6. And Elihu, son of Barachel, the Buzite, answered and said:

Few yet of days am I,
And ye now are elders;
Wherefore I shrank and was fearful
To shew unto you my knowledge.

7. For I said, It is days that should speak,
And abundance of years show forth wisdom.
8. Yet the spirit of God is in man,
And the breath of the Lord giveth knowledge.
9. The many of days know not wisdom,
The elders discern not judgment.
10. Wherefore I said, Hark to me;
I will show you, yea I, of my knowledge.
18. For I with words am o'erfilled;
The spirit within me constrains me.
19. Like to wine without vent is my bosom,
Like to flasks of new wine is it bursting.

6. Prevailing meter is resumed. Line *b* of second couplet lacks an accent. Bi. before **ישישים** adds **שבים**; Ley before it **רוקנים** or before **צעיר** an **אמרת**, Duhm **קלכם** which has fallen out before **על כן**, MT **זחלתי** "fear" here only. (Cf. Aram. **דחל**.) Probably from Ar. **זחל** "shrink." (Cf. B. D. B.) **היה** Aram. = **היגיד** 32:10, 17, with **דע** 15:17; 36:2; Ps. 19:3 only. **דע** Elihu only, 32:10, 17; 36:3; Plu. 37:16 = **דעת**. MT **אתכם**. Budde, Beer suggest **אתכם**.

7. Cf. 12:12; MT **יריעו**; Bi. **יריע**. Note plural vb. with **רב** in 15:20.

8. MT **רוח היא**. Rd. for parallelism with Sym. **רוח אל**. So Bi. Budde. Cf. use 27:3; 33:4; 34:14; Isa. 42:5. Perhaps it was changed because of later dislike of the suggestion. Duhm **רוח תאיר אנוש**; cf. Ps. 119:130, **אכן** here only in Job.

9. MT **רבים** "the great." Rd. with LXX Sah. Vet. Lat. Syr. Vul. **רב ימים**,—so Duhm, Beer. MT is probably a scribal error. The change improves parallelism and meter. Budde **שבים** (cf. 15:10). Bi. inserts **כי** before v. 9.

10. MT **שמעה**; 2 MSS LXX, Syr. Vul. **שמעו**. So Hit. V 10*b* = v. 17*b*; v. 10*a* is similar to v. 17*a*. Duhm, Beer rd. vv. 15-17 after v. 9 omit v. 10 as var. of v. 17. Duhm retains **לכן** for v. 15. Budde reads vv. 13, 14 before v. 10, omits vv. 11, 12, 15, 17. Bi. omits vv. 12, 15, 16, 17. Hatch omits vv. 11-17. The LXX omitted vv. 11*c*, 12, 15, 16 Vv. 11-16 are read in this text as an introduction before chap. 34. V. 17 is a duplicate of v. 10.

18. MT **כי**; Duhm **אני**. Beer suggests **אנכי**, 18*a* is over short. Kethib **מלחי** Qere, 20 MSS **מלאחי**. **בטני**, lit. "belly" (B. D. B.), Eng. "bosom." Cf. 15:2, 35. **רוח** "spirit," used as in v. 8, not "breath." Bi. inserts before v. 18, with LXX of v. 17, **עוד אצקה**; begins line *b* with **מלים**.

19. MT **הנה** before v. 19. Perhaps om. with LXX Vet. Lat. for sake of meter. Bi. Beer rd. **הן**. MT **אבורה**. The word is used only here in this sense, elsewhere "necromancer" MT **יבקע**. Rd. probably with Duhm, Beer, **הבקע**,—scribal error influenced by preceding verb.

20. I will speak then that I may find ease;
I will open my lips and will answer.
21. Let me not 'fore a mortal pay reverence;
Unto men let me not give fair titles.
22. For I know not how I should speak thus,
Right soon would my Maker destroy me.

CHAP. 33

1. But hearken now, Job, to my speech,
Unto all of my words give thou ear.
2. For lo, I have opened my lips;
My tongue in my mouth giveth utterance.
3. Upright as my heart are my words,
The knowledge of my lips speak they purely.
4. 'Tis the spirit of God which hath made me;
The breath of the Lord hath life given.
5. If thou canst, give me answer in this;
Set thy cause now before me, stand forth.
6. See I, before God, am as thou;
From clay was I fashioned, I also.

20. וִירֵרוֹ, lit. "be wide," I Sam. 16:23; Jer. 22:14, "find air," "be refreshed"; rare in impersonal use.

21. MT **נִשָּׂא פָנִים** **וְאֵל** **אָדָם** proposed (Kit. ed.) **וְאֵל** **אָדָם**, lit. "respect the per-on of." **אֲכַנָּה** "betittle," elsewhere only Isa. 44:5; 45:4; cf. with v. 21 chap. 13:8, 10, 11.

22. MT **אֲכַנָּה** as in v. 21. Vul. reads perhaps **אָכֹן** "abide," "be firm." **כִּמְעַט** "soon"; cf. Ps. 81:14. **עֲשֵׂי** "my Maker." Cf. 4:17; 35:10.

33:1. Job is here for the first time addressed by name. **אוֹלָם** is characteristic of Job 2:5; 5:8; 13:3; 12:7; 14:18; 17:10, etc.

2. **פִּי** and **חֹכְמִי**, lit. "mouth" and "palate." Cf. for usage 6:30; 29:10; 31:30. Bi. omits v. 2, Budde reads it as *Vordersatz* to v. 3.

3. V. 3a. lit. "The uprightness of my heart are my words." Cf. Prov. 8:6-8. Rd. as Budde suggests, **שִׁפְתֵי** as subject of **מִלְלִי** and Gen. after **דַּעַת**. MT **יִשְׁרָר**, Beer **רָהַשׁ** (Ps. 45:2), Duhm **רָשַׁק** (Joel 2:24), "Mein Herz strömt über von Worten der Erkenntnis." MT **אֲמַרִי וְדַעַת**, Wr. **אָמַר**, Duhm, Beer **אָמַרִי**, **דַּעַת**, Syr. om. **דַּעַת**. MT **בִּרְרוֹ** is pass. pt. used adverbially. Cf. Zeph. 3:9. The vb. **מִלַּל** is found in 8:2 and elsewhere only twice in the O.T., an Aramaism.

4. Om. v. 4 as var. of 32:8; 33:6; so Budde, Duhm, Beer. LXX, v. 4b = 32:8b. The verse is certainly misplaced; if genuine rd. after v. 6. Bi. adds **גַּם אֲנִי** after **עֲשֵׂתִנִּי**; Syr. rd. **עֲוִרְתִּנִּי**.

5. Rd. with LXX, Vet. Lat. after v. 5a **לְזֹאת**. This improves sentence structure and meter. Syr. rd. apparently **דִּקְר**; Ley with Syr. or **עַל-זֹאת**, Duhm **אָהָה** Duhm adds **מִלִּין** after **עֲרַכָּה**, this vb. is used only in Hithpael. For use here cf. I Sam. 17:16. Cf. v. with 13:18; 23:4.

6. For vv. 6, 7 cf. 9:34; 13:20, 21; 23:6. MT **קָאֵל**, Sym. **לֹא אֵל**. Beer

7. My fear, it shall not dismay thee,
My hand be not heavy upon thee.
8. Howbeit, thou hast said in mine ears,
Yea the voice of thy words I have heard:
9. "Pure am I, free from offense;
Clean, and in me is no sin.
10. Lo, He findeth occasions against me
For His foe hath He me accounted;
11. He setteth my feet as in stocks,
And all of my goings He watcheth."
12. I answer, in this thou art not just;
For God is mightier far than mortals.
13. Wherefore then striv'st thou with him?
Unto all thy words shall he not answer.
14. For once speaketh God with a man,
And yet twice he turneth not from him.

suggests the reading of Sym. קרצתי, lit. "nip off." The vb. is used only in Ps. 35:19; Prov. 6:13; 10:10; 16:30. חמר "clay" is mentioned as the material from which man was made. Job 4:19; 10:9.

7. מ' אכפ' "pressure," here only. Rd. rather with LXX נכפי. So Ols. Hit. Wr. Hoff. Sieg. Budde, Duhm, Beer. Cf. 9:33b; 13:21b. Rd. probably also as Budde, Duhm, Beer to agree with כפי, הכבד. Bi. omits לא in line b for the sake of meter.

8. LXX omits v. 8a as unnecessary; it is supplied from Theo. MT מלין. Rd. with LXX אא, Syr. Tar. Vul. מליה, which is better in the context. So Bi. Budde, Duhm, Beer.

9. MT הוה. Many MSS have small ה which by tradition implies that Elihu did not consider Job "clean." The word is an Aramaism, found only here. MT אנכי, Bi. אני, in 9b.

10. MT הוה, Beer תוהו, MT תניאות, "oppositions," is used only in Num. 14:34. Rd. with Baeth., Wr. Budde, Duhm, Beer, תוהו (Sing.-Jd. 14:4, and denominative of התהווה, II Kings 5:7). This gives meaning required by context. Cf. 10:13-17; 13:24b-27; 19:11.

11. Line a=13:27a. Bi. Duhm, Beer om. v. 11 as var. of 13:27. Om. rather 13:27b as supplied from v. 11. סד, only here and 13:27, is probably loan word from Aram. סדא.

12. It is possible and very attractive to read v. 12a with LXX and Vet. Lat. הן זאת צדקתי ולא אנה, "Lo, righteous I am, but he answereth me not." Cf. 9:2 f., 32. Beer, הצדקתי ולא אנה; Bi. הצדקתי ולא אנה (cf. 19:7; 30:20); Duhm, אנה לא אנה; MT ירבה; Duhm (after LXX?), מקלים; (Hiph. Pt. of עלם, as Ps. 10:1), "Es verbirgt sich Eloah vor den Menschen." רבה in this comparative sense is without parallel. (Cf. B. D. B.)

13. MT דבריו. Rd. with Vul. דבריה. So Dill. Hit. Sieg. Budde; this sense is required by context. Bi. Beer, Duhm, דברי; Bi. Duhm rd. כי as an introduction to direct discourse.

14. MT ישורנה, which is not supported by any version. Rd. probably

15. In a dream, in the visions of night,
On his couch, when he lieth in slumber.
16. Then openeth He the ear of man.
With fearful forms He frighteth him.
17. To turn a man from his way,
To cause him to cease from his pride.
18. His soul He draws back from destruction,
His life, that it pass not to Sheol.
19. He is chastened with pain on his couch,
Ceaseless through all of his members;

with Sym. *קסיר* or *קסירקה* (cf. LXX translation in Prov. 5:7), which gives meaning required. God does speak more than once. Bi. *קסירקה*; Sieg. Budde, *קסירקה*; Beer with Syr. Vul. (*repetit*), *קסירקה*, or with Duhm *קסירקה*; LXX omits the verse after *לא* as superfluous. For form of expression cf. 5:19.

15. Line *b* = 4:13*b*, "When sleep falleth upon men." But the verse here is overloaded; probably om. *b* as an insertion from 4:13. So Bi. Budde, Beer, Duhm. LXX 261 omits. Rd. *ב* before *קסירקה* with 6 MSS LXX, Syr. Vul. So Beer. *בחנומה*, lit. "in slumbers," is a late Wisdom word found Prov. 6:4; 6:10; 24 33; and Ps. 132:4 only.

16. V. 16*a* employs a form of expression used here and in 36:10, 15 to suggest the Divine revelation (cf. I Sam. 9:15). MT, *קסירקה*; Hoff. Budde, *קסירקה*; Duhm, Beer rd. with LXX Vet. Lat. *קסירקה* (= *מוראים* Deut. 4:34), "terrors," LXX, *ἐν εὐδαιμονίᾳ φόβου τοιούτοις*. Rd. therefore better with LXX *קסירקה*; this gives necessary length to the line and a better reading. The similarity of the two successive words caused confusion possibly and *מסרם* was an easy conjecture. MT, *קסירקה*, point with LXX A. Vet. Lat. Syr. *קסירקה*. So Bi. Wr. Hoff. Budde, Duhm, Beer; *קסירקה* is not in place in the passage. Cf. 7:14-16.

17. MT *קסירקה*. Rd. rather with Syr. (Vul.?) *קסירקה* as Ols. Dill. Sieg. Budde. *קסירקה* Hir. Del. Hit. *קסירקה* rd. by Bi. Duhm with LXX, Beer *קסירקה* or *קסירקה*. MT *קסירקה* "pride," Aram. Job 22:29; Jer. 3:17; LXX Vet. Lat. rd. *קסירקה*. So Beer with *קסירקה*. Syr. also *קסירקה*. MT *קסירקה* "he covers" is not appropriate in context. Rd. with Dill. Budde, Duhm, *קסירקה* Bi. *קסירקה* (Isa. 33:12; Ps. 80:17), Sieg. *קסירקה*. Bi. also transposes *קסירקה* to v. 18.

18. *חיה*, usual meaning "animal," Elihu 33:18, 20, 22, 28; 36:14; "life," also Ps. 74:19; 78:50, etc. Elsewhere in Job *חיים* is used. MT, *בשלה*, "by the sword," does not give a probable meaning here. Cf. v. 28. Rd. probably with Duhm (Syr. *אברנה*) *בשלה*, better parallel with 18*a*.

19. MT *קסירקה*. The Perf. is not good here. Rd. probably *קסירקה*, LXX Syr. *קסירקה*, Beer *קסירקה*, Duhm *קסירקה*, Budde *קסירקה*. MT *מכאוב*, "pain," in Elihu Speeches; elsewhere in Job *קאב* is used. MT *משכבו*: Beer omits suff. with LXX, Vul. MT, *קסירקה*, Occ. Kethib. Rd. *קסירקה* with Occ. Qere, Or. Theo. Sym. Targ. Vul. cf. 4:14. Dill. Duhm, rd. Qere; Budde, Hoff. Kethiv; Sieg. *קסירקה*; Beer *קסירקה* (cf. Hb. 3:16; Prov. 12:4). Possibly rd. *קסירקה*. *ב* might easily have been dropped before the two similar letters. This would

20. Loathsome is meat to his soul,
And the food of desire to his spirit;
21. His flesh is wasted away;
His bones are laid bare to men's sight;
22. His soul draweth near to destruction,
And his life cometh nigh unto death.
23. If there be an interpreter for him,
One from among a thousand,
To make known unto man his chastening,—

make possible a more natural translation of אָתָּן and give intelligible reading. MT אָתָּן is contracted from אָתָּן "unceasing," "continuous," Duhm אָטָּר. LXX omits 19b, perhaps because of unusual words. Bi. omits.

20. MT רָזָה מִתּוֹ, an impossible form of the word, is used only here. Rd. probably רָזָה מִתּוֹ. So Duhm, Beer. Budde רָזָה. In cognate languages the stem means "be foul," "loathsome" (Ar. Aram.). Sieg. omits the word as corrupt. Voigt considers v. 20 a gloss on v. 22. LXX omits v. 20b, probably as superfluous. For thought of v. 20 cf. Ps. 107:18.

21. MT מִרְאִי "from sight," a pausal form from רָאִי. The form is unusual and the sentence very awkward. Duhm, Beer מִרְזִי (Isa. 10:16; Ps. 106:15 only), "leanness." It is possible to read with Syr. מִרְאָה "from fear." MT Kethiv יָשָׁפִי "bareness." Qere וְשָׁפִי. Rd. Qere, since a vb. is needed here; so Sieg. Duhm, Beer. Wr. וְשָׁפִי "seek," with the thought that "his limbs seek not to be seen." MT לֹא רָאִי. The phrase is very awkward in construction, and does not give the meaning required here. Rd. rather לְמִרְאָה "to sight" (cf. LXX καὶ ἀποδείξῃ τὰ ὁστὰ αὐτοῦ κενά). Bi. Duhm strike as gloss after מִרְאִי, Budde with ל of v. 22 reads לֹא נֹאדִי (Ct. 1 10; Ps. 93:5), "which are not comely." The verse is in any case very prosaic, but the wasting effect of disease is clearly indicated with or without text emendation.

22. MT לְמַמְתֵּי "to the death bringers." Rd. with LXX Vet. Lat. Syr. Tar. לְמַתָּה, or better לְמַתָּה, Hoff. Perles, Budde. לְמַתָּה. MT supposedly refers to death angels, but is supported by no parallel passage and it is inappropriate that life should draw near to the death angels. The correction was probably introduced later to accord with the gloss in v. 23.

23. MT reads מַלְאָךְ "angel" before מְלִיץ, but for several reasons it appears probable that it represents a later addition to the verse, perhaps under the influence of 4:14, 15. The meter is improved by its omission, nothing else in the passage suggests a supernatural agent, and the interpretation in accord with the entire thought of Elihu is that he is suggesting himself as the Daysman of 9:34, who is to make clear to Job the meaning of his affliction (cf. Introduction). מְלִיץ (Gen. 42:23; Isa. 43:27; II Chr. 32:31 only) is in no case used of a supernatural intermediary. Clause b, to refer to מַלְאָךְ, should follow it. The phrase is used as in 9:3 to mean the one among many; Budde, Sieg. omit it as gloss, Budde also מַלְאָךְ. MT לְהַגִּיד, Duhm, Beer with LXX, Syr. וְיַגִּיד. MT יִשְׁרֹר is not the proper word here. Rd. with LXX מִיִּסְרֹר. So Duhm, Beer. מִי has fallen out after אָדָם. Bi. reads

24. He hath pity upon him, and pleadeth,
 "Let alone that he pass not to Sheol;
 The price of his soul—I have found it."
 25. Then his flesh groweth soft like a lad's;
 To the days of his youth he returneth.
 26. He prayeth to God, who hath mercy,
 That his face now with joy he beholdeth,
 Yea, He restoreth unto man his uprightness.
 27. Then he singeth before men, and crieth:
 "I have sinned and perverted the right
 Yet not as my sin was it visited upon me."

לֹא at the beginning and omits clause *c*. LXX has a four-line addition after v. 23 which is in reality an amplification and double translation of vv. 23, 24. Genung interprets the passage as referring to Elihu, though he retains מַלְאָךְ, which he translates “messenger.” Posselt (p. 17) quotes Volck and Knabenbaur as interpreting the passage without reference to an angel.

24. Rd. simple Impf. in the verbs of v. 24a, not conversives, as Budde. MT **וַיִּתְחַנֵּן**, Hoff. **וַיִּתְחַנְּנִי**, or **וַיִּתְחַנְּנִי** "he supplicates." MT **פָּדְעָהוּ**. Rd. with MSS Ken. 206, 454 **פָּדְעָהוּ** (Job 15:4) (cf. Cheyne, J.Q., July, 1897, p. 577). MT form is unknown. Hoff. Budde, Duhm, Beer rd. as above; Dill. Sieg. **פָּדְעָהוּ** or **פָּדְעָהוּ**. MT **מִרְדָּת שָׁחָה**, Budde omits as a gloss. Rd. **נָפְשׁוּ** after **כָּפַר**, which was probably lost through confusion with following vb. in v. 25. Meter and thought demand it.

25. MT **רַטְפֶּשׁ**, a quadrilateral stem, is found only here. Altschüler *Z.A.T.W.* (1886), p. 212, proposed **טַפֶּשׁ**; Bi. Hoff. Budde, Duhm, Beer **יטפֶּשׁ** "be gross or fat," found only Ps. 119:70. Perhaps it is better to rd. with LXX **רַרֶּה** (cf. LXX translation II Kings 22:19; Ps. 54:21). Probably the verb became transposed with **נַפֶּשׁ** of v. 24 and the present confusion resulted. MT **מַנְעֵר**. Rd. rather with LXX Syr. **כֶּנֶּ**. Bi. Beer, Duhm rd. v. as part of address and the Jussive **רָשׁוּב עֲלוּמִי** Aram. Plu., abstract, 20:11.

26. וירצהו, lit. "And he is gracious unto him." MT נִרְיָא must be read as Hiph. since God is still the subject; so Dill. Budde. Beer suggests נִרְיָאֵהוּ, Hit. with Syr. נִרְיָא. Point both verbs as simple imperfects. MT יִשָּׁב, Duhm, Beer rd. יִרְבֹּשׁוּ, or יִרְבֹּשׁוּ, for parallelism with v. 27a. For thought of vv. 26, 27 cf. 8:21; Ps. 22:22, 25; Ps. 27:6; Isa. 38:20.

27. MT יִשֹּׁר "he looketh." Point נִשֹּׁר, Hit. Dill. Budde, Duhm, Beer. This meaning is required by context. Point נִרְאֶמֶר instead of conversive. Add probably with LXX Vet. Lat. at end of v. 27 כְּבִלְרִי for meter and to complete the thought. So Duhm, Beer. Bi. כְּהִתְאֵתִי. MT שְׁנָה is difficult. Budde, Duhm שְׁנָה, Sieg. הַשִּׁבִּי. If MT is correct, "it was not equaled to me" is the meaning here. (Cf. B.D.B.) Budde reads שְׁנָה וְלֹא אֵל שְׁנָה. Bi. transposes v. 26c and v. 27a and reads וְיִשֹּׁב לְאֹנֹשׁ צִדְקִי. "Sich selbst dann spricht er Tadel, Verkündet dass ihm Heil ward."

28. "He redeemeth my soul from destruction,
And my life now beholdeth the light."
29. Behold all this worketh God,
Twice and yet thrice with a man;
30. To bring back his soul from destruction,
To enlighten with the light of life.
31. Attend now, oh Job, hark to me;
Be silent, and I will yet speak.
32. If thou hast words, give me answer;
33. Else, give thou ear unto me;
Hold thy peace, I will teach thee wisdom.

CHAP. 35

2. Canst thou account this for justice,
Callest it "my righteousness before God"?
3. That thou sayest, "What profiteth it thee?
What availeth it, that I sinned not?"

28. Vv. 28 and 29 are obelized in LXX and supplied from Theo. but the Gk. of v. 30 represents Heb. v. 28. Vv. 29, 30 are the omitted verses. Sah. reads vv. 27, 28, 31a. So Bi. Rd. with Keth. LXX (v. 30). Theo. Syr. נפשי וְהַיְהִי. Qere Tar. Vul. rd. 3 per. suff. MT בשעה MSS Ken. 158, 270 בשלה. Budde suggests this reading or מְרַדָּה for מַעֲבֵר (cf. 33:24; Ps. 3:10; 55:24).

29. LXX Sah. om. as superfluous. For form of expression cf. 5:19.

30. MT לְהַשִּׁיב, Beer with Syr. הַשִּׁיב or מַשִּׁיב. MT לְאֹרֶר (= לְהַאֲרִי), "be light," but difficult here. Rd. as Wr. לְאֹרֶר, Duhm לְאֹרֶר. Correction is needed to make intelligible. Syr. לְרִאֲרֹר "to behold."

31. LXX omits v. 31b to end, as unnecessary and out of place before 34:2f. Gk. MSS 23 and Cod. Alex. rd. after v. 28 (Gk. v. 30), 34:1, 2, then כִּי אֶמַר (Cod. Alex. adds אֵיבָר) followed by 33:29, 30. Evidently the omitted vv. were supplied here on the margin and later given their present position. Duhm, Beer(?) frsp. vv. 31-33 after 34:16. Bi. reads line a with one from 34:1 מְרַדָּה אֶלֶּה אֶלֶּה, and omits 31b to end. Budde omits v. 33.

32. צִדְקָה is a Piel Inf.

33. וְאֶלְפָּה. The vb. אֵלַה in the Piel meaning "teach" is an Aramaic use, found only Job 15:5; 35:11, and here.

35:1. "And Elihu answered and said." The heading is no more in place here than in 34:1 or 36:1. 35:2 should probably follow directly on 33:33. Bi. Wright om. v. 1.

2. MT צִדְקָתִי "my righteousness." Perhaps we should read with LXX Syr. Tar. Vul. צִדְקָתִי "I am more just than God." So Ols. Beer. The MT gives a better parallel here, however.

3. This verse is omitted by MS B. of the LXX, but MSS א. C. 23, and other cursives rd. it. MT לֵךְ, Beer, Duhm rd. לֵי. Cf. 19:28; 22:17 for a similar change of person. MT אֶעֱלֶה, H ff. Sieg. rd. תֵּעֲלֶה, as addressed to God. MT מִהֲטָאֲרִי is used hypothetically, "more than if I had sinned." Eliphaz is really quoted here. Cf. 15:3; 22:2.

4. I will answer to thee yet a word,
And unto thy friends that are with thee.
5. Look unto the heavens and see,
Behold the skies—how high above thee.
6. If thou sinnest what dost thou against Him?
What to Him if thou multiply sinning?
7. If righteous, what givest thou Him?
Or what shall He have from thy hand?
8. 'Gainst a man like to thee is thy sin,
Thy righteousness but toward a mortal.
9. For that oppressors are many, men cry out;
Groan 'neath the arm of the mighty.
10. Yet say not "Where is God who hath made us,
Who giveth songs in the night time?"
11. 'Fore the beasts of the field doth He teach us,
'Fore the fowls of the air makes wise.

4. LXX but not Vet. Lat. adds שלשה before רעייה. This is the only direct reference by Elihu to the friends after the introduction, and the statement here would be singular after chap. 34. Bi. Budde omit v. 4.

5. Cf. for v. 5, 11:8; 22:12. שחקים is used 36:28; 37:21; 38:37. Cf. also Isa. 45:8.

6. MT בר, but this usage is only found here. Possibly rd. with 2 MSS, Ken. Syr. Vul. לו. MT הפעל, Budde הפעל. Bi. omits תעשה for the sake of meter. Cf. 7:20; 22:3.

7. Vv. 7b-10a are omitted in LXX Codd. Colb. Marm; Syr. Hex. Sah.; Cod. Bodl. omits vv. 8-10a. LXX probably read the text but vv. 7b, 8 were considered superfluous. Bi. Hatch omit the verses, reading v. 7b with v. 10b.

8. בן אדם is found elsewhere in Job only in 25:6.

9. V. 9, as stated above, is omitted by some MSS of the LXX, probably because of its somewhat loose connection with the foregoing and the change of person. Vv. 9 and 12 are a little puzzling here, but Elihu is apparently answering Job's claim that unjust oppression goes on unheeded. Cf. 9:24; 24:12. Duhm omits vv. 9, 12; Beer transposes v. 9 before v. 12. MT עשוקים. Rd. probably with MS Ken. 368 Theo. Sym. Syr. Tar. Vul. עשוקים for the sake of the parallelism. MT יזעיקו; cf. with יצעקו in v. 12—both with the same meaning. MT רבים in the sense of "great" is not good here after רב "number." Probably read רעים as in v. 12 with Beer. Budde suggests this reading.

10. If the verse is to follow v. 9 we must read plurals with the Syr. אמרו and עשו. So Budde; Sieg. reads the former. MT עשו; cf. עשו 32:22. MT מזמור, Wr. מזמור (cf. 38:32). For the thought cf. Ps. 77:7 f., Ps. 149:5.

11. MT מלפני = מלפני. For the use of the Piel of this stem cf. 33:33; cf. 12:7, 8. It is lack of trust on the part of the oppressed which explains God's apparent silence, Elihu would say.

12. So they cry—and he answereth not—
For the haughtiness of the evil.
13. For surely God will not hear vanity,
The Almighty will not regard it.
14. Yea, for thou sayest, thou beholdest Him not,
Thy cause is before Him, thou waitest for Him,—

CHAP. 36

2. Suffer me a little, that I may show thee,
For I have yet words for God.
3. I will bring my knowledge from afar,
I will show forth the justice of my Maker;

12. LXX Syr. Hex. Sah. om. v. 12a. Codd. Alex. 23, 161 om. also v. 12b. LXX probably had the entire verse, but v. 12a was omitted for the same reason as v. 9. Duhm omits v. 12 with v. 9 as a gloss. Bi. omits, but Hatch mistakenly retains the extra verse as though found in the LXX. MT שם is curiously used here, but certainly cannot have local meaning, "there." The verse is awkwardly constructed; לא יענה should logically follow v. 12b.

13. Bi. Duhm insert שָׁפַת before שֵׁרָא to agree with fem. ending of יִשׁוּרְנָה. Budde inserts שָׁנַעַת; Ley reads שָׁנַעְתָּם after שְׁדִי, but it is probably simpler and better to read יִשׁוּרְנִי, agreeing with שֵׁרָא; an additional word is not needed in the line.

14. V. 14 should be followed immediately by 36:2. It introduces another appeal of Elihu for God's justice. Vv. 15, 16 which obviously are out of place here, as structure and thought show, are read before 34:34. MT תִּשׁוּרְנִי. It is possible we should read with Tar. Vul. (LXX, καὶ ὥσπερ με). יִשׁוּרְנִי "He regardeth it not." Bi. with LXX reads יִשׁוּרְנִי, Voigt אִשׁוּרְנִי. MT דִּין "judgment" Perles, Budde, Duhm, Beer rd. דָּיָם (Ps. 37:7), "be silent," but the form is very unusual. Bi. reads דִּין from an Arab. root, "Beug dich." MT יִתְחַוֵּל. The form is apparently a Polel of חוּל, but it is found only here = "wait." Budde, Beer rd. Hithpolel יִתְחַוֵּל (Ps. 37:7). Bi. reads with LXX יִתְחַלֵּל "so wirst du danken." If a change is to be made rd. יִתְחַלֵּל, probably, from יָחַל "wait" (Job 29:21, 23; 30:26, etc.). Budde suggests this reading also. Budde and Duhm rd. the last clause as a command of Elihu to Job, but the present text does not support such a reading.

36:1. וַיֹּסֶף אֵלִיהוּ וַיֹּאמֶר "And Elihu added and said." The verse is to be omitted like the other headings; it is especially disturbing between 35:14 and 36:2 which are in immediate connection (cf. 27:1, 29:1). It is omitted by Bi. Duhm; Beer transposes it before 35:15.

2. כָּתַר is used in Aram. sense of "wait," but only here in O.T. זָעִיר "a little" is found elsewhere only Isa. 28:10, 13. MT לְאֵלֶיהָ, LXX (ἐν ἐμοί) may have read לְאֵלֶיהָ, as Hoff. does. Bi. inserts בִּי, Duhm לִי after עָרַד. Cf. 13:7, 8.

3. MT דַּעֲי. Cf. 32:6. Hoff. reads רָעִי "Ich ehre den, der mich aus der Ferne behütet." לְמַרְחֹק is found in this form in Job only 39:29. (Cf. Isa. 37:26.) פַּעֲלִי is only used here in this form.

4. For surely my words are not false;
One perfect in Knowledge is with thee.
5. Lo, God is mighty in strength;
Rejecteth not the pure of heart.
- 7b. Kings upon thrones He setteth,
And they without end are exalted.
8. But if they be bound with fetters,
Be taken in the toils of affliction,

4. *תמים דעות* "falsehood" is very common in Prov. *שקר*, cf. I Sam. 2:3 and a similar phrase in 37:16. The Plu. *דעות* is found only here and I Sam. 2:3. The other uses refer to God and this may be the reference here, but the context seems against this interpretation. Wright omits *עמק* as a gloss and reads *תמים דעות הן אל כביר*.

5. V. 5 as it stands in the MT is very awkward and almost impossible in construction. Bi. reads *הן* as *הִנֵּה* with v. 4 and in v. 5 *אל לא ימאס בר* *אל לא ימאס*. Duhm, Beer om. *כביר לב* as a variant of *כביר לב*, also om. *כה* as further gloss, rd. *כביר לב* and join with v. 6a. Ley *כה ולב*, Budde suggests *יִהְיֶה לָב* (cf. 9:4). Probably rd. *כה* after *כביר* in v. 5a. This gives a good half-line and the transposition is easily explained by similarity of form in v. 5b. Then read in v. 5b, *בר לב*. Cf. LXX, *οὐ μὴ ἀποποιήσεται τὸν ἄκακον*, and Syr. which rd. apparently *בר כחלב*. The change supplies the necessary object for *ימאס*, gives an appropriate thought and the corruption is easily explained. For use of *בר* cf. 11:4; Ps. 24:4; 73:1; also *ברור* in 33:3. LXX omits v. 5b as superfluous. Here begins supposedly the second of the large LXX omissions, but it is evident that the LXX and Sah. read v. 6a before v. 12, v. 6b after v. 15, and v. 7a instead of the Heb. v. 17. The real omission thus begins with v. 7b. The passage reconstructed in the order of the LXX yields a far better connected and more intelligible reading: the verses will therefore be read in this order, allowing the connected insertion to precede. The obelized passages are marked as follows in the various recensions: vv. 5b-9, 10b-11 Cod. Colb. (also v. 5a) Syr. Hex. Sah.; vv. 5b-11 Codd. Vat. (248 H. and P.) Alex. Marm.; vv. 7-11 Cod. Bodl. It is, however, evident from the Sah. that the inserted verses are 7b-9, 10b-11, also vv. 12, 13, 16, 17 of the Heb. text, which will be considered later. These verses read together yield a connected thought on a theme not directly related to Elihu's argument, and their omission leaves the text much clearer. For further discussion see the introduction. Hatch omits vv. 5b-9.

7. The vv. 7b-9, 10b-13 are concerned with the fate of kings. The construction in this verse is very awkward. MT *וְאֵת*. Some vb. perhaps stood here originally, but rd. text as the sign of the Acc. (So Syr.) Duhm, Beer rd. *אם* (cf. Theo. *μετά*). MT *וְיָשִׁיבֵם*. Rd. with Ley, Duhm *לנצח*, lit. "forever," is really connected with *ישיבם*. Cf. for verse Ps. 89:16.

8. MT *אסורים*. Budde reads *אסרם* with God as subject. *זקים* "fetters," from an Aram. root *זקק*, is found only Na. 3:10; Isa. 45:14, and Ps. 149:8. Cf. especially the last reference for form and thought. Cf. also Ps. 107:10.

9. He showeth them then their deeds,
Their transgressions,—that they are o'erweening.
- 10b. Speaks, that they turn from their evil.
11. If then they hearken, and serve Him,
They live out their days with good,
And all of their years in delight.
12. But if not, they pass unto Sheol,
And without knowledge, they perish.
13. For the godless in heart cherish anger,
They send forth no cry when he binds them.
- 10a. Through chastening He openeth their ear,
- 6a. But He granteth not life to the wicked.

9. MT **יִהְיֶה**, Budde reads **יִהְיֶה**. "be haughty." The Hithpael is found Job 15:25; Isa. 42:13, and here.

10. V. 10a belongs to the original text of the passage as shown by the LXX and Sah. and is read with v. 6a before v. 12 (LXX text). Hatch retains the half-verse, but Bi. omits. Do not rd. Vav Consecutive in **וַיֹּאמֶר**. This use of **אָמַר**—"to command to," is late; found in Dan. Ch. Est.

11. MT **וַיַּעֲבֹדוּ** "serve," is found in this absolute sense only Isa. 19:23. MT **יִכְלֹו**, Hoff. with about 70 MSS Ken. reads **יִכְלֹו**, as in 21:13. MT **וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ בְּנֵי יִמִּים**, Duhm and Beer om. as gloss. The last line is a little short, but the three lines are too long for one couplet.

12. V. 12 is not obelized, but it is evident that the LXX translation of v. 12, quoted by Clement of Alex. and the Sah., bears only a very superficial relation to the Heb. text and cannot represent it. The verse, as is shown by its immediate connection with v. 11, belongs also to the insertion but was wrongly identified with v. 12 of the LXX, the Heb. of which may have been pushed out before the insertion. Bi. and Hatch both retain the verse. Duhm suggests that the omission of vv. 7b-11 would be far more probable if v. 12 could be included as it indeed should be. MT **לֹא יִשְׁמְעוּ**. It is possible we should follow Beer's suggestion and om. the vb. as inserted from v. 11 because of the length of the line. MT **בְּשֵׁלַח** "by the sword," as in v. 18. Probably rd. with Duhm as Syr. **בְּשֵׁלַח**, though the MT may be correct here and 33:13 changed to agree with it.

13. Codd. Alex. Vat. Marm. Bodl. and Syr. Hex. and Sah. om. v. 13. Bi. and Hatch om. and Budde strikes as a gloss. It belongs with the connected insertion vv. 7b-9, 10b-13. **חָנָה** is found in the Elihu sections elsewhere only 34:30. Other words are employed for "wicked"—**רָשָׁע**, etc. MT **שִׁים אָה** "lay up anger," is a very awkward expression, and perhaps incorrect. Duhm supplies **בְּלֶקֶם** after **שִׁים** (cf. Ps. 13:3); Hoff. reads **אָה** as a conjunction and **לֹא** referring back to v. 13a—"Nicht einmal Anstalt machen um Hilfe zu bitten."

10a. The order of the Gk. text has been indicated in a note on v. 5. Vv. 10a and 6a (LXX v. 12a) form the first couplet in the Sah. text after v. 5. Clement of Alex. quotes the passage in this order, Strom. 4. 26, p. 641, *Δικαίων ἐς ακούει ὁ θεὸς ἀσεβῆς δὲ οὐ σώζεται*, followed by the Gk. of v. 12b. In the

- 12 LXX. For they seek not the knowledge of the Lord;
And chastened, they yet hearken not.
14. Their soul perisheth in youth,
Their life like to the unclean.
15. But the afflicted by affliction He delivereth,
Through suffering He openeth his ear.
6b. Judgment for the oppressed He giveth;
7a. From the just withholdeth not justice.

disorder of the text due to insertion the Gk. of v. 12a was not recognized as the Heb. v. 6a and a parallel translation was added from Theo. The verse follows well on v. 5 and gives a good antithetic parallelism. למוסר, lit. "to chastening," LXX rd. לִישָׁר. The phrase is very characteristic of Elihu. Bi. reads v. 6a with v. 5 as follows: צָדִיק לֹא יִחִיָּה רָשָׁע.

12. It has been already stated that the present Heb. v. 12 belongs with the insertion. The LXX and Sah. rd. after v. 6a (v. 12a Gk.) the following:

παρὰ τὸ μὴ βούλεσθαι εἰδέναι αὐτοὺς τὸν κύριον,
καὶ διότι νοουθετοῦμενοι ἀνῆκοι ἦσαν.

Clement of Alex. reads the first line with τὸν θεόν for τὸν κύριον after vv. 10a, 6a. This probably represents a Heb. text somewhat as follows:

מִבְּלִי דַעַת אֵל יִחְפָּצֵי
וְכִי יִהְיֶה לֹא יִשְׁמְעֵי

This gives a good parallel verse in harmony with Elihu's argument and appropriate between vv. 10a, 6a and v. 14. For the usage in line a cf. Job 4:20b, 21b; 24:8. Vet. Lat. reads in line b, "et cum monerentur." Though the Gk. cannot represent the present Heb. text, the resemblance of a phrase led to its being retained as parallel. The original Heb. may have been dropped when the insertion was made.

14. MT תָּמִית, probably rd. with 18 MSS Ken. תָּמִית. MT בְּקִדְשִׁים. Rd. with Tar. כֶּכ־, Hoff. בְּקִדְשִׁים "durch Heilige." The allusion is to temple prostitutes and was, Duhm suggests, proverbial of an early fate. Budde omits the verse. Cf. 33:18, 25.

15. V. 15 continues the theme of v. 10a in the contrast between the rebellious and submissive. MT אָזַנִּי. Rd. probably with Vul. אָזְנִי. So Budde, Duhm, Beer. The change here brings the application to Job's case. LXX v. 15a represents Heb. v. 15, but v. 15b=Heb. v. 6b as recognized by Budde, Dillmann, Duhm, Bi. Bi. reads vv. 15, 6b, 7a, followed by v. 18.

6b, 7a. These two half-verses obviously form one couplet as in Heb. text. In the Gk. they also follow one another in vv. 15b, 17, though separated by the inserted v. 16. There can scarcely be a question that they are in place here rather than after v. 5. Such confusion must be the work of an interpolator, not the LXX translators. V. 7a, MT עֵינַי. Rd. with LXX (v. 17) as Budde and Beer דֵּינִי, Duhm צֶדֶק מֵעֵינַי, Budde צָדִיקִים.

16. Thee also hath lured,
Away from the cry of distress,
Freedom that had no constraint,
The peace of thy board, full of fatness.
17. The judgment of the wicked thou fulfillest;
Judgment and justice lay hold on thee.
18. Let not wrath stir thee against chastening,
Greatness of ransom turn away thy heart.

16. This verse is omitted by Codd. Alex. Colb. Vat. Marm. Bodl. and Syr. Hex. and Sah. It must form a part of the insertion because it interrupts the connection between vv. 6b, 7a in the Gk. vv. 15b, 17. It was apparently added with v. 1 to restore connection with the passage after the transposition as 34:33. Like that verse it is very irregular and obscure. It is possible to understand God as the subject and give it a favorable sense—the interpretation adopted by Hrzs. Del. Hit. Budde, and others, or to read רחב as subject with Ew. Dill. Hoff. and Ley. Though both have difficulties, the latter seems more probable. Duhm and Beer transpose רחב ונחת before מפּי and rd. as subject. MT הסִירָהּ “entice,” can hardly be used in a good sense because of 36:18. Hrzs. Hit. הִסִירָהּ; Beer suggests הִסִירָהּ. MT וָאֵה. Rd perhaps with Hrzs. Dill. Duhm, Beer וָאֵה, or with Budde וָאֵה אֵה. MT מִפִּי צָר, lit. “from the mouth of distress.” Hoff. reads מִפִּצִּיר “dich Eigensinnigen.” MT תַּחֲתִיָּה, Bi. Budde rd. תַּחֲתִיָּה, Duhm תַּחֲתִיָּה. MT וְנָחָה “quietness,” as Job 17:16 from נָחָה, Voigt וְנָחָה “das Fleischstück.” Wright reads as 3 Fem. Sing. of Aram. stem. The word is strangely used here and Sieg. omits it as corrupt. For the thought of the verse indicating prosperity cf. Ps. 4:1; 18:20; 23:5; 118:5. For a similar use of פִּי cf. I Sam. 2:1 cited by Ley.

17. V. 17 of the LXX, Vet. Lat. and Sah. is a close translation of v. 7a and has only the word דִּין in common with the Heb. v. 17. This verse also, though not marked with the obelisk, belongs to the inserted verses and is closely connected with v. 16. Bi. Budde om. מְלֵאָהּ, lit. “thou art full” is curious. Sieg. מְלֵאָהּ. MT דִּין (v. 17b) is omitted by Duhm, Beer, as a repetition of דִּין in v. 17a; they also rd. וּמִשְׁפָּטוֹ תִּמְכָּדָה, and Duhm reads לְחֵמָה from v. 18 with v. 17. Ley וְהִמְכָּדָה Hoff. strikes כִּי of v. 18 as dittograph and reads תִּמְכָּדָה with v. 17, “Urteil und Gericht welche das Gift festhalten.”

18. Om. כִּי of MT as dittograph of כִּי at the end of v. 17 with Bi. Hoff. Duhm, Beer. MT תִּמְכָּדָה, Ew. reads תִּמְכָּדָה, Bi. תִּמְכָּדָה, Budde תִּמְכָּדָה, Beer תִּמְכָּדָה. Rd. the MT probably as a *casus pendens* belonging with the following clause. MT בְּשִׁשֶּׁק is a doubtful word. (Cf. B. D. B.) In Job 20:22 שִׁשֶּׁק = “fulness,” so translated here by Hoffman. Bi. בְּשִׁשֶּׁק, “gegen den Züchtiger.” Budde, לְשִׁשֶּׁק “zum Höhnen.” Duhm מִשְׁשֶׁק “chastisement,” but the form does not occur. Beer omits ב. It is probably best to rd. with Dillmann “bei der Züchtigung” from rt. שִׁשֶּׁק or שִׁפָּק “strike,” “clap.” (Cf. 34:26.) כֶּפֶר, cf. 33:24. The ransom is the cost of suffering and submission.

19. Shall He order thy deliverance without distress,
And all the forces of might.
20. (Desire not the night,
When peoples go up in their place.)
21. Beware, lest thou turn unto sinning;
For this cause wert thou tried with affliction.
22. Lo, God is exalted in might;
Who is like unto Him to be feared?
23. Who hath appointed Him His way?
Who shall say, "Thou hast wrought evil."
24. Remember that thou magnify His work,
For thereof all men have sung.

19. The verse has had many and various readings. One interpretation reads שוֹעֵה as "thy wealth," and עֵרָה as "be equal to" (cf. 28:17, 19), referring to the ransom of v. 18. This is held by Hrz. Wright. שוֹעֵר is then pointed בָּצֵר "gold," Job 22:24, 25. Another interpretation reads שוֹעֵה "thy cry" (cf. 30:24), as subject, "Wird dein Geschrei (dich) ausser Bedrängnis setzen," so Del. Budde. Budde points שוֹעֵה. Dill. Hoff. understand God as subject and שוֹעֵה as object. "Wird er dein Bittgeschrei in Ordnung bringen, Ohne," etc. Ley reads הוֹעֵה; Bi. הוֹעֵה לוֹ בָּצֵר לָכֵל; Duhm reads שוֹעֵה and לוֹ for לֹא, translating עֵרָה as in 37:19, "Wird gegen ihn aufkommen deine Klage." The best suggestion is that of Beer, יוֹשַׁעַה, which is very easy and gives the sense required by the context. (Cf. Syr. דִּנְפִרְקָה.) MT מאמצי is probably "powers," but the word is found only here. LXX omits this clause, perhaps because of the difficulty of this word. Sieg. omits vv. 19, 20 as hopelessly corrupt.

20. V. 20 is hopelessly corrupt. It is omitted by the LXX, Syr. Hex. Sah. and may have belonged to the insertion. It may also have been omitted, because unintelligible. Bi. Hatch om. Budde makes no attempt to translate v. 20b, Sieg. omits the verse as corrupt. Duhm alters to read: אֵל תִּשְׁאָה הַלֵּלֶת: לְעֵלּוֹת עִם מִתְחַבֵּם, "Nicht betrüge dich die Thorheit, dich zu erheben mit dem der sich weise dünkt." MT מִתְחַבֵּם, Voigt reads מִתְחַבֵּם.

21. MT על־זה, Budde, Duhm, Beer rd. עוֹלָה "iniquity." MT בְּחֵרָה "thou hast chosen." Rd. the vb. in the Aram. sense, "try," "test," as Isa. 48:10 with Ew. and Wright. Point בְּחֵרָה. The reading is supported by the Syr. and gives a much more natural interpretation to the passage. V. 21b is omitted in LXX, Syr. Hex. Sah., but evidently belongs in the text. Bi. omits vv. 21b, 22a.

22. MT יִשְׁגִּיב "be exalted." Hiph. is found only here. Beer suggests יוֹשַׁעַי, regarding ב as dittograph. MT מוֹרֶה "teacher." Rd. probably Aram. form מִרְא "fearful" (LXX δυνάστης). So Ew. Hrz. Stud. Bi. Baeth. suggests מִרְה or מוֹשֵׁל. Cf. Isa. 30:20 for MT and Dan. 2:47 for corrected form. Cod. Vat. marks 36:22—37:6 as omitted.

23. Cf. 9:12; 34:13.

24. MT חֲשׂוּנֵי. Wr. reads as a Hiph. denominative, "Remember how great is his work." MT שָׁרָרִי is probably a Polel from שָׁר "sing" (cf. 33:27). Wr. reads it from שָׁר "see." LXX, Sah. Syr. Hex. om. vv. 24b, 25a as super-

25. Every man may look upon it;
A mortal shall see it afar off.
26. Lo, God is exalted, we know Him not;
The number of His years is unsearchable.
27a. For He restraineth the drops of the water;
28b. Makes His cloud to o'ershadow many men.
33. He appointeth a season for the cattle,
They know the place of their lying down.

fluous; they probably understood שרר as "see." The parallelism shows the lines should be retained. Hatch omits 36:24b—37:5a of the Heb. text.

25. Bi. Budde omit v. 25. Cod. Alex. marks vv. 25-28b as omitted.

26. With v. 26 begins the last of the large, connected insertions omitted in the LXX text. The verses omitted in the section 36:26—37:14 form a connected poem on the rainstorm. V. 26 may have formed the opening verse of the poem or may have been added here when the poem was inserted. It is somewhat irregular and resembles 36:22a, 37:5b very closely. Budde, Duham, Beer om. as a gloss; Bi. also omits it. MT מספר שניר, Duham suggests מעשיר שניר "great" is an Aramaism, found here and in 37:24. The omitted verses in the various recensions to the end of the chapter are as follows: Cod. Vat. vv. 22-33, Cod. Alex. vv. 25-28b (Gk. text) vv. 29-33, Codd. Marm. Bodl. vv. 26-28a, vv. 29-33, Cod. Colb. vv. 29-33, Syr. Hex. Sah. vv. 26, 27b, 28a, 29-33. For further discussion of the omission cf. Introduction.

27a, 28b. These two half-lines formed the verse of the original text between which was inserted the verse 27b, 28a of the Rainstorm Poem. V. 27a probably motivated the insertion. MT יגרע is usually translated "draw up," but "restrain," "withdraw" (15:4, 36:7) represent its meaning more accurately. MT נטפי מים, Duham, Beer rd. נטפים מים. The noun נטפי is found only here. V. 28b has a double translation in the LXX, one having been mistakenly added from Theo. LXX rd. ἐσκίασεν δὲ νέφη ἐπὶ ἀμυθήτῳ βροτῷ; so also Sah. Theo. γροφωθήσονται. Vul. praetexunt, rd. probably ירה עב עלי or possibly יכסה (cf. Ps. 147:8). חפה "cover" is translated by σκιάζειν in Deut. 33:12. This reading is good and the corruption not hard to explain. The עב fell out before עלי and the ירעפ of MT was adopted after the insertion, perhaps under the influence of Isa. 45:8, where this form is parallel with יזיל. MT רב, Sieg. רב, Wright רביבים "showers."

33. After v. 28b the LXX Codd. B. Alex., Vat. (248) and 10 cursives, Syr. Hex. Sah. rd. two verses; MS C and 21 cursives after 37:5a:

ὦραν ἔθετο κτήνεσιν, οἶδαςιν δὲ κοίτης τάξι.
ἐπὶ τούτοις πᾶσιν οὐκ ἐξιστάται σου ἡ διάνοια, οὐδὲ διαλλάσσεται
σου ἡ καρδία ἀπὸ σώματος;

The last two lines are easily recognized as the Heb. 37:1, as Dillmann, Bi. Duham have already observed. But the two lines which precede represent also the preceding Heb. 36:33, which has become very corrupt. The Heb. represented is somewhat as follows: יגדיר עת למקנה ידעו מקים מעונה. This text gives a good parallel verse structure, perfectly appropriate after

37:1. At this is not thy heart stirred,
And leapeth it not within thee?

27*b*. He poureth out the rain as His mist,

28*a*. Which the skies drop down from above,

29. Who can know the spreading of the cloud,
The thunderings of His pavilion?

v. 28*b*, and is not far from the radicals in Heb. v. 33. On the other hand v. 33 in its present form is unintelligible and has given rise to innumerable conjectures, none of which are satisfactory. Sieg. omits the verse as unintelligible in its present condition. The corruption of the text is due to displacement, when the insertion was made. In the present context the verse had no meaning and various attempts at correction were made. If ידעו and למקנה became transposed the ensuing corruption is easily explained. Because of this corruption Origen failed to recognize the Gk. v. 28*b*, *c* as representing Heb. 36:33, 37:1; he inserted a duplicate translation from Theo. and allowed the Gk. verses to retain their original position after v. 28. If the inserted verses 36:29-32, 33:2-5*a* are removed, the position of these two verses is the same in MS C and 21 cursives. The evidence for an insertion is almost indisputable. Dill. and Duhm pronounce Gk. v. 28*b* a gloss on 36:33*b*, 37:8. Bi. retains 36:33, but reads the Heb. text which yields no appropriate sense. Cf. for thought Ps. 104:20-22.

37:1. This verse is quite closely represented by the Gk. v. 28*c*. MT אה. Rd. probably as Bi. Duhm הלא; also with LXX, Vet. Lat. לכה as do Bi. Duhm, Beer. Syr. reads לבן. MT נתר from נתר "leap." Cf. Hab. 3:6. MT ממקומו, lit. "from its place." The verse expresses the effect of pondering on the wisdom of God, as expressed in vv. 27*a*, 28*b*, 33. In Codd. Colb. Vat. Marm. Bodl. this verse is obelized in its position at the beginning of chap. 37. Syr. Hex. obelizes v. 1*a*. The Sahidic, of course, reads the verse after 36:28.

27*b*, 28*a*. LXX, Sah. Syr. Hex. om. these lines as already noted under v. 26. They form the real beginning of the Psalm of the Rainstorm found in 36:27*b*, 28*a*, 29-32, 37:2-5*a*, 6*b*, 11, 12 (cf. Introduction). MT יזק is from rt. זקק, used of refining of metal, and rare (Mal. 13:3; Ps. 12:7). Rd. with Vul. (*effundit*) יצק, Theo. ἐπιχύσονται, Syr. reads 3 Mas. Sing. This gives a far more natural reading. Duhm יזק, Hoff. Budde יזקי. MT מטטר, Wr. ממטר. MT לאדר, Duhm מאדר. אדר is found only here and in Gen. 2:6. Wright reads the final ל with v. 28*a*. Bi. omits vv. 27*b*, 28*a*, but reads a part of vv. 28*a* with v. 28*b*. Cf. here Ps. 104:13.

29. Vv. 29-32 form an unbroken section of the inserted poem. Bi. omits the verses, Budde vv. 29, 30. Cf. Ps. 18:11, 105:39. MT אה. Rd. rather with Syr. רמי. So Sieg. Budde, Ley, Duhm, Beer. The MT gives an ambiguous sense. MT מפרשי "the spreadings," is found only here and Ez. 27:7. MS Ken. 245 מפלשי. Cf. 37:16. MT תשארות "thunderings," the form is dubious; we should perhaps rd. with Beer some form from שרה, Theo. ὡρυρεται, Sym. ἐξ ὡρης, but no suitable form is known. MT סכחו; for the probable reference see Ps. 18:12.

30. Lo, about Him He spreadeth the cloud,
And He covereth the tops of the mountains.
31. For thus He judgeth the peoples;
Yea, and gives good in abundance.
32. About His hands He wrappeth the lightning,
He directeth it unto its goal.

CHAP. 37

2. Hark now and hear the rumbling of His voice,
The muttering that goeth forth from His mouth.
3. Under all the heavens He sendeth it forth,
His lightning upon the ends of the earth.

30. MT **אִירו** "his light"; in the context **אִירו** is better and the change very easy. Theo. (LXX MS **א^α**) reads $\eta\delta\omega$, a transcription of the form in MS B $\eta\ \phi\delta\eta$; Tar. **מִיטְרָא**, Duhm, Beer rd. **אִירו**. MT **וְשִׁרְשֵׁי הַיָּם** "the roots of the sea," is a very improbable reading and furnishes no parallel to v. 30a. Duhm's suggestion is attractive and easy, **וּרְאֵשֵׁי הָרִים**. MT **כִּסֵּה**, Budde reads **גָּלָה**, Marshall **כִּסֵּא** "the roots of the sea are his throne." The suggestion to make **הַיָּם** refer to the heavenly sea (Hrz. Hit. Hoff.) is unconvincing.

31. **בָּם** "by them," must refer to **אִירו** of v. 30, thought of in collective sense. His rainclouds bring judgment and bounteous harvests. MT **יִדִּין**, Beer **יָדִין** "gives food." MT **מִכְבִּיר** is found only here with the force of a substantive, Hiph. of **כָּבַר** in 35:16. Cf. with this section Ps. 107:33-36; Job 37:13.

32. MT **וַיִּצַו**, lit. "commandeth." MT **בְּמִקְפֵּי** "the assailant," but the Hiph. Part. is not what is wanted here. Rd. with Ols. Hoff. Dill. Budde, Beer, Duhm **בְּמִקְפֵּי** "the mark" (cf. 7:20). MT **עֲלִיה**, rd. perhaps with about 5 MSS Ken. Sieg. Budde, **עֲלִי**, referring to the lightning. Duhm proposes for v. 32, **בְּמִקְפֵּי הָאֵשׁ וְהַקֶּלְעֵדִי** "Auf der Schleuder wiegt er das Licht, und schleudert es auf das Ziel." The Rainstorm Poem is continued without interruption in 37:2-5a. The poem is printed as a whole in the section of the introduction on "The Omissions of the LXX Text."

37:2. Vv. 2-5a, 6b continue the Rainstorm Poem after 36:32. The omissions of the MSS are as follows: vv. 2-5a, Codd. Alex. Colb. Vat. (248 H. and P.) Marm. Bodl. and the Sah.; vv. 2b-5a, Syr. Hex.; v. 6b, Codd. Colb. Bodl. Syr. Hex. Sah.; v. 6, Cod. Alex. MT **שָׁמַעִי**, Duhm and Beer rd. with Theo. and Syr. **שָׁמַעִי**. This may be correct. Del. Hit. Budde, Genung, and others find here a suggestion of the whirlwind in which Yahweh appears. The reference is, however, quite general. Hatch omits vv. 2-5a, a part of v. 6b and v. 7a. Bi. omits vv. 2-5a, 6b.

3. MT **יִשְׁרְהוּ** is probably from **שָׂרָה** "send forth," found only here and in the Qere Jer. 15:11; cf. Aram. **שָׂרָא**. MT **עַל** may perhaps be a mistaken writing for **אֵל**, as Budde regards it.

4. And after it roareth a voice,—
 He thundereth with the voice of His majesty,
 He stayeth not, when His voice is heard,
 6b. The rain and His mighty storm.

5b. Great things He worketh,—we know Him not;

6a. For He saith to the snow, "Fall earthward."

7. Upon every man He setteth a seal,
 That all men may know His doing.

4. V. 4a, b forms the first couplet here; v. 4c should be read with v. 6b. Of the intervening lines vv. 5b, 6a belong to the original text and v. 5a is undoubtedly a weak gloss on v. 4b, as Budde, Duhm, Beer have recognized. It was probably added when the Rainstorm Poem was inserted here. MT קול. Possibly rd. with Budde, Duhm, Beer, and 2 MSS Ken. קורו. MT גורו. ירעם בקול גורו, Duhm reads אל ירעם, and גורו as object of ירעם; the following מ and כי he reads as מפני and translates, "Nach ihm brüllt sein Donner, Gott lärmt mit seinem Donner, Seine Kehle hemmt er nicht, aus seinem Munde lässt sich hören sein Donner." Budde reads גורו for גורו. MT יעקב, 2 MSS Ken. יעקב (cf. Tar.). The word is used here like Aram. עכב "hold back," which should perhaps be read (cf. B.D.B.). Hoff. translates "verfolgen" like Syr. עקב. Budde פרקם. The suffix in יעקבם is usually interpreted as referring to the lightning, but the reference is very remote. It stands in apposition to the object in v. 6b, which forms a very appropriate conclusion.

6b. MT וגשם מטר וגשם מטורות עז. There is evidently a dittograph here, for the line is too long. Probably om. with Syr. וגשם מטורות, since מטורות is an unknown form. Ols. Sieg. Duhm, Beer om. Sieg. reads וגשם המטר. 3 MSS Ken. om. וגשם ומטר, as do Hoff. and Budde. Rd. גשם ומטר. MT עז, Duhm תעז, Hoff. Beer עז "be mighty." Cf. with the verse Ps. 29:3.

5. V. 5a through נפלאות is omitted by the LXX witnesses. The first three words are certainly a gloss on v. 4b and are omitted by Budde, Duhm, Beer; נפלאות is in a very curious construction. The whole line was probably added by an editor. MS Ken. 223 omits. Duhm suggests נפלאות אל נפלאות. Budde reconstructs the latter part of the verse from 36:26, עשה נפלאות ואין, הקר גדלואת. It is after v. 5a that Gk. MS C. and 21 cursives rd. 36:33, 37:1, thus confirming the omission and the position of these verses after 36:28b, where they are found in Gk. MSS B. Alex. Colb. and others and in the Syr. Hex. Sah. V. 5b with v. 6a forms the next verse of the original text after 37:1; so Bi.

6a. הורא is probably an Aram. form of Ar. הרה "fall." 16 MSS Ken. הרה, Vul. *descendat*. Sieg. Budde rd. ריה "water" (cf. Isa. 55:10); Graetz, Perles ריה. V. 6b following upon v. 6a is in a very peculiar construction and interrupts the connection in thought between v. 6a and v. 7. It follows far better on v. 5a.

7. In retaining v. 7a a departure is made from the evidence of the LXX and Sah. The line, however, plainly belongs in this context, not in the

8. Then the beasts go into their dens,
And abide in their hiding places.
9. From His chamber cometh the tempest,
Out of the storehouses cold.
10. By the breath of God ice is given;
And the water's breadth lies in constraint.
 11. Yea, He ladeth the thick cloud with lightning,
The cloud scattereth forth His light.
 - 12a. And is turned about on every side,
To work according to His wisdom,—

Rainstorm Poem; it may have been considered too similar to v. 7b. Bi. retains the entire verse. MT בִּיר gives a very curious statement. Rd. with Hit. Duhm, Beer בִּיר and cf. the use in 9:7 and Jd. 3:23. Duhm omits כל in v. 7a, Budde that in v. 7b. MT אֲנָשִׁי מַעֲשָׂהוּ, Hoff. Duhm, Beer rd. אֲנָשִׁי, Budde אֲנָשִׁים עֲשָׂהוּ, Dill. Wr. אֲנָשִׁים עֲשָׂהוּ. It is simplest to read with the Vul. as Ols. Baeth. אֲנָשִׁים מַעֲשָׂהוּ. Sieg. omits vv. 7, 8 as an interpolation, out of place in the context. This difficulty is removed if the Rainstorm insertion is recognized.

8. MT נַחְבֵּוא. Probably rd. with Budde simple Impf. מַעֲנֶה. Cf. 36:33, 38:40. Duhm regards the Greek 36:28b = Heb. 36:33 as a gloss on this verse which became misplaced.

9. הַחֹדֶר "the chamber." Duhm adds תִּימָן (9:9) and omits the article; Hoff. regards the word as the name of a planet. MT רִמְמָזִים is probably a Piel Part. from זָרַה, referring perhaps to "the scattering" winds. So Dill. and Bi. translate, but the parallel is not good. Hoff. Duhm refer it to planets or stars (Vul. *Arcturo*). Rd. probably with Voigt, Budde, רִמְמָזִים, for the sake of the parallelism. Cf. Ps. 144:13. Sieg. omits the word as corrupt. A similar form of expression is found in 38:22; Ps. 104:13; 135:7.

10. MT יִתֵּן. Rd. with Sym. Syr. Tar. Hit. Budde, Duhm, Beer. יִתֵּן. Dill. Hoff. read אֵל as subject of יִתֵּן. MT מִיָּצָק, lit. "constraint." Wr. translates "molten" = "mirror." Cf. 37:18. For vv. 9, 10 cf. Ps. 147:17. Bi. omits v. 10. Only v. 10a is omitted by the majority of LXX witnesses and this is due to its likeness to v. 9b. The verse structure shows that it should be retained.

Vv. 11, 12a, b, 13 form the conclusion of the Rainstorm Poem. They are omitted by the Syr. Hex. and Sah. The exact limits of the omissions in the Gk. MSS are a little hard to ascertain. The LXX must, however, have read v. 12c since the present Gk. text has a duplicate translation of the line. V. 11 was not omitted in the Gk. and Lat; v. 12a, b, c are lacking in Cod. Colb.; v. 12b, c in Cod. Marm.; vv. 12c, d, 13 in Cod. Vat. (243 H. and P.); v. 13 Codd. Alex. Bodl. The three omitted couplets should follow vv. 4c, 6b. Bi. retains vv. 11a, 12. MT קָרִי is apparently ב and a form רִי from רוּה "saturate," but it is found nowhere else. Sym. Vet. Lat. Vul. rd. *frumentum*, פָּרִי. Hoff. reads רִי = רָאִי "Schaustück," Duhm קָרִי "hail." Probably read with Budde for the sake of parallelism בָּרֵק. MT יִטְרִיחַ "burden," but the verb is found only here. Cf. noun, Isa. 1:14; Deut. 1:12, and cf. also 26:8. Beer

- 12c. All these things He hath commanded them,
On the widespread face of the earth.
13. Whether for judgment on His land,
Or if in mercy He send it.
14. Hear this, oh Job, and give pause;
Ponder the marvels of God.
15. Knowest thou how He ordereth His work,
Makes the light of His cloud to shine forth?
16. Knowest thou the poisonings of the clouds,
The marvels of the Perfect in Knowledge?

proposes וְיָרַח "send forth," from an Ar. stem. MT שָׁנָה should be pointed שָׁנָה with 15 MSS Ken. Theo. Tar. (MSS). Vul. and Budde, Duhm, Beer.

12. V. 12 really forms two couplets, the first of which was omitted in the LXX and forms a part of the inserted poem. That the omission only extended through לַפְעֵלָם and not through יָצוּם is indicated by the Sah. text and by the duplicate translation of v. 12c in the present LXX. V. 12a, b refers to the cloud and lightning of v. 11, thought of in the collective sense. This should be followed by v. 13. The clouds are turned about to work God's will for judgment or blessing. MT מְסֻבֹּת is a plural from מָסַב, found only here. Probably rd. with Budde מְסֻבִּיב "round about." Beer inserts after it וְסֻבֵּב, Budde וְהִהָלֵךְ, to supply a vb., but מִתְהַפֵּף should be read with v. 12a. Duhm, Ley insert with Budde וְיִתְהַלֵּךְ, but after מִתְהַפֵּף. V. 12b consists of בְּתַחְבּוּלוֹ לַפְעֵלָם in which the first word counts for two accents: בְּתַחְבּוּלוֹ, Kethib לְתָחוֹ, Qere לְתָחוֹ. The word belongs to the Wisdom vocabulary and is found only Prov. 1:5; 11:14; 12:5; 20:18; 24:6. MT לַפְעֵלָם, Beer reads לַפְעֵל, and joins with מִכָּל אֲשֶׁר.

12c, d form a couplet giving a summary of vv. 5b, 6a, 7-10, which should be followed by v. 14. In the original form אֲשֶׁר may have been אֱלֹהֵהוּ, which LXX reads here. MT יָצוּם, Beer reads יִצְוֵהוּ. MT אֲרָצָה (cf. Prov. 8:31), Budde, Beer rd. אֲרָצָה (34:13); Duhm כְּרָצְנוֹ (Est. 1:8). Sieg. omits v. 12c, d as a gloss.

13. MT לֹא לְאֲרָצוֹ, Duhm reads וְלִמְאָרָה "for a curse"; Hit. לֹא רָצוּ, Hoff. לְרָצוֹ = לְרָצוֹ. Beer suggests omission of second אִם and vb. יָרַיָהוּ. Om. the second אִם with Sah. and Sieg. Dill. Budde, Duhm, Beer. The parallel verse structure is much improved by this correction. MT וְיִצְאָהוּ, rd. probably with Duhm וְיִצְאָהוּ, which gives a far better meaning. Bi. Budde om. the verse. It follows well on vv. 11, 12a, b and forms a very appropriate conclusion to the Psalm of the Rainstorm. The comparison which Duhm suggests with Enoch, chap. 59, is very striking. Cf. also 36:31 and Ps. 107:33-36.

14. MT עָמַד, Beer עָמַד.

15. MT אֱלֹהֵי עֲלֵיהֶם. Rd. with LXX Sah., as do Bi. Duhm, אל פְּעָלָיו. In the MT עֲלֵיהֶם has no suitable antecedent and the construction with על is very curious. MT בְּשׁוֹמֵם, Perles בְּשׁוֹמֵם. Budde omits vv. 15, 16 as glosses.

16. MT הִתְרָאָה. Beer proposes מִפְלְשֵׁי. MT מִפְלְשֵׁי "weighings," is found only here. The same formation is found in מִפְרָשֵׁי, 36:29, which

17. What time thy garments are hot about thee,
When the earth lieth still 'fore the south wind,—
18. Canst thou beat out with Him the skies,
Firm like to a molten mirror?
19. Show me what we might say unto Him!
We order not our speech for our darkness.
20. Should it be told Him I would speak—
A mortal speak unto his own confounding?
21. For now men behold not the light,
When yet it shines forth in the skies,
When a wind hath passed and cleared them,
22. And from the north cometh a shining,
Upon God is terrible majesty!

Budde reads here. Sieg. omits the word as unintelligible. MT מפלאות. The form should probably be the same as that in v. 14, נפלאות; so Syr. apparently and Sieg. Budde. LXX ἐξάλσις δὲ πτώματα πονηρῶν. Duhm proposes פתאים מפלאות רעים מפיל תהום מרעם.

17. The relative אשר may be interpreted as referring to Job—so Dill. Hoff. Budde Bi. Wr., "Thou whose garments," etc. The verse is to be connected with v. 18. Heat, as cold, is of God's sending and Job is powerless before them.

18. הרקיע "beat" or "stamp out," is usually used of gold. The Hiph. is found only here. MT ראי "mirror," is found only in this place. The verse apparently refers to the hard, glittering aspect of the midsummer heaven. Duhm, Beer trsp. before v. 21. Bi. omits the verse which is omitted by some of the LXX witnesses. The last line may have caused difficulty.

19. MT הודיעני, rd. with about 25 MSS Ken. LXX, Syr. Oriental Kethib עני, as do Bi. Dill. Beer. MT נערך "order," is used of speech as 32:14 and 33:5 without an object. Voigt נערך. Ley inserts after it לפני. MT השך "darkness," is used of ignorance, as Eccles. 2:14, or of perplexity, as Job 19:8. Sieg. omits the word as uncertain.

20. MT היספך. Duhm היסיר, and ירבר for ארבר. Hoff. reads יספר יספך. Duhm reads יבלע as related in meaning to בלל. בלע appears to be used here in the sense of "confound," "confuse," as Ps. 55:10; lit. "swallow up."

21. MT בהיר "bright," "brilliant," occurs only here and is dubious. Probably rd. with Sieg. בהיר "when it giveth light" (cf. Syr.). Budde בהיר, Beer suggests בהר, obscurus from בהר, as in Syr. Bi. omits v. 21c and v. 22a. Duhm reads v. 21a, c as a couplet and v. 21b after v. 22a. Vv. 21c, 22a form, however, a very good couplet, as do vv. 22b, 23a. Del. Hit. Budde and others believe that the moment before the appearance of Yahweh is here pictured. The best interpretation is that of Dillmann: men cannot gaze upon the unveiled sun, how then hope to behold the majesty of God. The following verses bear out this interpretation. Budde reads in v. 21a ראני.

22. MT זהב "gold," is somewhat dubious and inappropriate here, even

23. The Almighty we cannot find Him;
Mighty in strength and judgment,
Great in justice, He afflicteth not;
24. Therefore shall all men fear him;
The wise in their own sight He regardeth not.

THE WORDS OF A SECOND WISE MAN

CHAP. 32

Vv. 11-16. *Introduction to Chap. 34*

11. Behold, for your words I have waited;
I hearkened unto your reasonings,
While that ye sought you out words.
12. Yea, unto you I attended,
But lo—none reprov'd Job,
None of you hath answered his words.
13. Say not, we have found us out wisdom,
Let God, and not man, overthrow him.
14. Not with words against me hath he striven,
Nor with words like to yours would I answer.

in a figurative sense. Rd. probably זָהָר "brightness," Ez. 8:2; Dan. 12:3 with Duhm, Beer. Sieg. reads יְהִיָּה MT נִרְאָה "fearful," Beer suggests נִרְאָה. Cf. Ps. 104:1, 2. V. 22b is parallel with v. 23a.

23. MT שְׁנִיָּה is an Aramaism. Cf. 36:26. MT וְרַב. Rd. rather with Syr. וְרַב, as do Hoff. Duhm, Beer. It gives a better parallelism and construction. Duhm and Beer trsp. וְרַב צָרָה after כַּח and rd. וּמִשְׁפָּט with לֹא יַעֲנֶה. Sieg. omits לֹא יַעֲנֶה as a gloss. It is possible that we should point יַעֲנֶה "he answereth not," as Hr. Hoff. LXX, Syr. interpret in this way.

24. MT יִרְאֵהוּ. Rd. probably with LXX יִרְאֵהוּ. So Budde, Duhm, Beer. MT יִרְאֵהוּ. About 45 MSS Ken. read יִרְאֵה. Cf. Ps. 138:6.

32:11. Vv. 11-16 were inserted here by the compiler from their place at the head of chap. 34. The insertion is shown by the duplication of v. 10 in v. 17 to restore connection with v. 18. A new introduction addressed to the friends begins in v. 11; for a further discussion cf. the section of the introduction on "The Composition" of the Speeches. Vv. 11c, 12 are omitted by several LXX MSS, Syr. Hex. and Sah.; they are supplied from Theo. Duhm, Beer trsp. v. 11c and v. 12a. MT אֲצִיֵּן = אֲצִיֵּן (5 MSS Ken.). הִתְחַלֵּיתִי, Hiph. of חָלַל, is used only here and v. 16; elsewhere in Job the Piel is found, מְלָה "word," is an Aramaism; found 33 times in the entire book and 14 times in Elihu. Bi. with LXX reads עַד הַבְּנוֹתֵיכֶם מְלִי לְךָ בְּרִי הָאֲזִינוּ עַד הַבְּנוֹתֵיכֶם מְלִי לְךָ בְּרִיכָם.

12. MT בֵּין with עַד is found only here and 38:18 (doubtful) Syr. וְעַדֵּיכֶם.

13. MT מִצָּאָה "Beware lest," Job 32:13; 36:18. MT מִצָּאָה, Bi. מִצָּאָה. MT יִדְפְּנוּ, MS Ken. 245 יִדְפְּנוּ, MS Ken. 207 יִדְפְּנוּ. Juss. Impf. of נָדָה here; elsewhere Niph. is found. Hit. prefers the meaning of הָדָה "thrust," "push."

14. MT עָרַף, Syr. אָעָרַף "set in array," is used of words as here, 33:5;

15. Sore dismayed, they answered no more;
Their words had departed from them.
16. And I waited,—they spoke not a word—
They stood, but they found not an answer.

CHAP. 34

2. Hear now, ye Wise Men, my words,
Ye of knowledge, give ear unto me.
3. For the ear testeth words,
As the palate trieth meat.
4. Let us search out for ourselves judgment;
Let us know among us what is right.

37:19; Ps. 5:4. MT אָלִי, 2 MSS אֶלִּי. Bi. with LXX מִלִּין כְּאַלֵּה מִלִּין. Cf. for thought 13:18; 23:4.

15. Vv. 15, 16 are omitted by several LXX MSS, Syr. Hex. and Sah.; they are supplied from Theo. The verses add nothing in their present context. הִעֲתִיקָר. The Hiph. is found in Job 9:5 and used intransitively as here, Gen. 12:8; 26:22; Prov. 25:1.

16. Possibly om. עֲדָר with Theo. as repeated from v. 15; so Duhm. וְהוֹחֲלִיתִי is usually rd. as interrogative with question particle omitted.

17. אֶעֱנֶה אֲנִי הִלְקִי אֲחִיקָה דְּעִי אֲנִי

I will answer, even I, my share;
I also will show my knowledge.

V. 17 is a weak var. of v. 10 added when vv. 11–16 were inserted to restore connection with v. 18; it indicates limits of the original text. LXX reads: "Answering Elihu said, I will speak again." Cod. Alex. has v. 17 in small characters marked with an obelus. MT אֶעֱנֶה, Budde, Beer, Duhm rd. אֶעֱנֶה.

34:1. וַיִּשָּׂא אֱלִיהוּ וַיֹּאמֶר. This heading is not in place here. 34:2 should follow directly after 32:16, but this or a similar statement probably stood originally before 32:11 at the beginning of the introduction to this section. Duhm suggests that 34:1 may be from the hand of the reviser, who confused 32:11–17. The headings of the chapters are probably imitations of those in the dialogues.

2. The Wise Men addressed are certainly not the three friends, but the hearers of a Wisdom Debate or even understanding readers. Bi. reads הַאֲזִינוּ מִה טוֹב.

3. V. 3=12:11. LXX omits v. 3, probably because it is quoted. Theo. supplies the verse. MT לֹאֲכַל, Theo. Syr. Vul. rd. לֹאֲכַל, as do Sieg. Beer. Rd. perhaps rather לִי אֲכַל with Budde as in 12:11. Duhm reads v. 3 with 33:31 f. after 34:16; Beer transposes v. 3 after 33:33. Bi. Hatch om. vv. 3, 4.

4. LXX omits v. 4 with the exception of מִה טוֹב which they read at the end of v. 2, showing that they had the text of v. 4; Theo. supplies. MT נִבְחֲרָה, Kautzsch translates "test" or "find out by testing" (cf. Isa. 48:10), and considers the usage an Aramaism.

5. For Job hath said, "I am righteous,
But God hath taken from me my justice.
6. Though right is mine, I am counted a liar;
Without transgression,—grievous is my wound."
7. Where is a man like to Job,
Who drinketh up mocking as water?
8. He maketh fellow with doers of evil,
He walketh with men of sin.
9. And he saith, "It profiteth not a man,
That he find in God his delight."
10. Far be it from the Lord to do evil,
From the Almighty to work iniquity.
11. As a man's work doth He render unto him,
In the path of a man He findeth him out.

5. Cf. 9:15, 20; 13:18; 27:2.

6. LXX is marked as omitting vv. 6b, 7 (supplied from Theo.), but v. 8a of the Gk. probably represents Heb. v. 6b and v. 7 is omitted because quoted from 15:16. Bi. omits vv. 6b, 7; Hatch also reading v. 6a with v. 8a of Gk. MT **על משפטי**, lit. "Contrary to my judgment." MT **אֶכְזֹב**, Duhm **אֶכְזֹב**. It would be attractive to read **אֶכְזֹב** "I am in pain" (cf. Job 5:18; 14:22) for parallelism. (Cf. Jer. 15:18, where the root is used as a parallel to **אֲנוּשׁ**.) MT **הוֹצִי**, lit. "arrow" (cf. Job 6:4). Duhm **מִהָצִי** (Isa. 30:26) **תָּלִי** "sickness" (cf. Isa. 53:3, 4), is also proposed.

7. Cf. 15:16.

8. Cf. 22:15. MT **לחברה**, lit. "for fellowship," is fem. noun which is found only here (cf. B.D.B.). Dill. reads as an Inf. with fem. ending.

9. Job's words are not exactly stated here. Cf. 9:22; 21:15, 17. MT **יִסְכֵּן**. The vb. is used with **ל** in 22:2; 35:3, but cf. also 15:3. MT **בְּרִצְתוֹ**. The root is used with **עִם** only Ps. 50:18 and here. Budde omits vv. 9, 10a as a gloss influenced by 35:3.

10. MT reads in v. 10a **לֹכֵן אֲנֹשִׁי לִבִּי שְׁמָעוּ לִי** "Therefore, hearken unto me, ye men of understanding." But the line is too short for a verse and does not come in well between v. 9 and v. 10b, c which form a regular verse. LXX MS 23 marks the verse in the margin as an insertion. Probably omit with Bi. and Budde as a gloss added from vv. 2-4. Duhm fills out the verse as v. 2. MT **מִרְשָׁע**, rd. with LXX **מִרְשָׁע**. So Budde, Beer, Duhm; the sentence structure is improved by the change. MT **וְשָׁדִי**, rd. probably with LXX Sah. Aeth. **וְלִשְׁדִּי** for grammatical construction; so Bi. Beer, Duhm. MT **מִקְוִל**, but the line is too short. Rd. with Budde **מִקְוִל עֵינַי** (cf. 36:23). The reading is perhaps supported by the Syr. and the transcriptional error would be very easy because of the similarity of the letters. Duhm, Beer rd. **מִקְוִל עֵינַי** is found only here and 34:32 in Job; elsewhere **עֵינַי**.

11. MT **כִּי פָעַל**, rd. with LXX Syr. Sah. Aeth. **כִּי כָפַעַל**. The **כ** has fallen out after another. MT **כִּי אָרָה**. Rd. with LXX Tar. **כִּי אָרָה**. MT **רִמְצָאָנִי**. Rd. with LXX Qal. **רִמְצָאָנִי**. The Hiph. of **מִצָּא** is not common and the change improves the meaning.

12. Yea, surely God cannot do evil,
The Mighty perverteth not judgment.
13. Who is it hath appointed Him the earth,
Who hath 'stablished the circle of the world?
14. If He turn again to Him His spirit,
If His breath unto Him He withdraweth,—
15. All flesh would perish together,
And man return unto dust.
17. Shall a hater of right hold dominion,
Or the Just One, the Mighty do evil?
18. Who saith to a king, "Thou nothingness!
Thou wicked one!" unto the nobles.

12. MT **יִרְשָׁע**, but the Hiph. is usually used in the sense of "condemn" which is not usable here. Rd. perhaps with Budde, Beer, Duhm **יִרְשָׁע**. Cf. for thought 8:3.

13. MT **אֶרְצָה** is probably a poetic form (cf. 37:12; Isa. 8:23). MS Ken. 173 **אֶרְצִי**. Bi. Budde, Beer **אֶרְצָה**. MT **שָׁם**. Beer reads **עָלָיו** after it or with Budde **שָׁמַר**; Duhm transposes **לְבֹי** from v. 14 after **שָׁם** and reads **בְּתַבֵּל**. Wright transposes vv. 13-18 after v. 29 and reads in the order: 1-12, 19-29b, 13-18, 29c-37. Cf. with verse, 36:23.

14. MT **יִשִּׁים** is found in Qere both occidental and oriental. Rd. with 5 MSS Or. Keth. LXX(?), Syr., **יִשְׁיב**, which is necessary for the sense. So Budde, Beer, Duhm rd. MT **לְבֹי רוּחוֹ**. The two words are obviously variants and **לְבֹי** is to be omitted because of parallelism, as do Bi. Budde, Beer. Ley omits **רוּחוֹ**. For thought of verse cf. Ps. 104:29, 30; Eccles. 12:7.

16. **וְאִם בִּינָה שְׁמֵתָה זֹאת הָאֲזִינָה לְקוֹל מְלִי**. If the verse belongs here **בִּינָה** must be read with LXX Sym. A. Theo. Syr. Tar. Vul. in order to obtain a grammatical construction. Beer, Budde rd. thus. Dill. Duhm rd. **בִּינָה**. LXX MS 23 adds before the verse **וַיַּעַן אֱלֹהֵיוּ וַיֹּאמֶר**. Cod. Alex. prints the verse in small characters and marks it with an obelisk. The verse should probably be omitted as an editorial gloss like v. 10a. It interrupts the connection here and is not in harmony with the rest of the chapter which is addressed to the Wise Men. It was probably added to supply an appeal to Job like those of the other chapters. Duhm transfers 33:31-33 and 34:3 to a place before v. 16. Beer suggests this also.

17. MT **יִחַבְּשֵׁ**, lit. "bind," but this sense of rule is perhaps derived from Isa. 3:7 (cf. LXX, Isa. 3:7). **צָדִיק כְּבִיר** is a compound expression. Sieg. inserts **וְ** before **כְּבִיר**. MT **תִּרְשָׁע**. Rd. **יִרְשָׁע** (LXX reads *ἀσεβής* at beginning of v. 18). Cf. Syr. Tar. The change is supported by the versions and gives a better parallelism (cf. 34:12). The change is proposed in Kit. Ed. and read by Bi., "Gerechte Allmacht freveln."

18. MT **הָאֱמֹר**. Rd. with MS Ken. 349, LXX, Syr. Vul. Sah. Aeth. **הָאֱמֹר**, as do Ew. Hrz. Dill. Hoff. Budde, Baeth. Duhm, Beer. Sieg. omits the verse; Bi. reads as one line and combines with v. 19a.

19. Who giveth no reverence to princes,
But the poor as the rich He regardeth;
For the work of His hands are they all.
20. In a moment they die, and at midnight,
Yea, rich men are shaken and perish;
And the great are removed,—without hand.
21. For His eyes see the way of a man,
And all of his steps He beholdeth.
22. Nor darkness, nor shadow of death,
Shall hide there them that work evil.
23. For he hath appointed no place,
To come before God in judgment.
24. He shattereth the mighty, unquestioned,
In their place He makes others to stand.

19. V. 19b, lit. "He knoweth not the rich before the poor." MT נכר "know." Cf. 21:29. Duhm הָקִיר. Combine v. 19c with v. 20a.

20. MT וַיִּגְעֲשׂוּ is found Ps. 119:62, Exod. 11:4 only. MT phrase is unnatural and unintelligible in the context. Rd. with Budde, Beer וַיִּגְעֲשׂוּ שׁוֹעִם. The dropping out of the similar consonants would be very easy and the change gives the required parallelism. Duhm מָעָם. MT וַיִּסְרִרוּ, Beer with MS Ken. 17 וַיִּסְרִרוּ. Duhm וַיִּסְרִרוּ, Budde וַיִּסְרִרוּ. Rd. perhaps with Beer and MS Ken. 248 to agree with the vb. Beer in quoting these two MSS in Kittel's ed. has transposed their numbers.

21. Cf. 22:13; 31:2-4.

22. Bi. omits a part of v. 22, all of v. 23, and reads v. 24 as one line with v. 25. The LXX undoubtedly read the text; it condenses in v. 22 and paraphrases v. 23. Cf. for the verse, Ps. 139:11.

23. MT וַיִּשִׁים מוֹעֵד is not intelligible here. Rd. with Wr. וַיִּשִׁים מוֹעֵד "appoint a place of meeting." The corruption would be easy and the change affords an excellent sense in the context. So Budde, Duhm, Klosterman rd. Beer וַיִּשִׁים מוֹעֵד, Marshall מוֹעֵד. MT אֶל אֶל, Sieg. reads אֶת-אֶל. Cf. for verse, 9:32. Hatch omits vv. 23-33. Hoff. reads v. 23 after v. 28. LXX, Syr. Hex. Sah. om. v. 23a; Cod. Alex. Vet. Lat. v. 23.

24. לֹא חֶקֶר, lit. "without inquisition," Syr. Vul. translate "without number," which G. Hoff reads. Cf. 5:9; 9:10; 36:26. MT רַעַע יָרַע is Aram. loan word for רַעַץ, not found elsewhere in Job. Bi. reads v. 24a as one couplet with v. 25a. LXX of v. 24 is influenced by 5:9; 9:10.

25. לֹכֵן יִכֹּר מַעֲבְדֵיהֶם וְהַפֵּן לַיְלָה וַיִּדְכָּאוּ

Therefore he knoweth their works,
He overturneth them in the night, and they are crushed.

The verse is out of place in the context and is probably to be omitted as a weak gloss on vv. 20, 21, with the exception of וַיִּדְכָּאוּ, which is to be read with v. 26 for the sake of the meter. LXX omits v. 25b together with Syr. Hex. Sah.; Cod. Alex. vv. 25-33, Codd. Colb. Marm. Bodl. vv. 25-34. Budde

26. He crusheth and dismayeth the wicked,
In the sight of men's eyes doth He smite them.
27. For that they turned from following Him,
Unto all His ways gave no heed,
28. To bring unto Him the cry of the poor,
And the cry of the needy He heareth.
29. If He be silent who shall condemn?
If He hide His face who then may chide Him?
Alike with a man or a nation;
30. When He setteth a godless man as king,
Because of the people's transgressions.

omits vv. 25–28 as glosses; Duhm, Beer om. v. 25 through לילה and connect ידכא with v. 26. Bi. reads v. 25a. מעבר is Aram. for מעשה and found only here. MT ורפף, Sieg. reads ורפכם.

26. Rd. וידכא of v. 25 with v. 26; so Syr. (LXX reads probably with v. 26 as ידעף “he quenches,” cf. 18:5, 6; 21:17). Rd. probably וידכא and connect with the following (cf. 6:9). Bi. ידעכי רשעים. MT תחת רשעים, has no meaning here. Rd. יתחת רשעים “he dismayeth the wicked.” Bi. Budde rd. תחת רש' חמתו. Duhm for רשעים reads רשעים (cf. Am. 6:11). MT במקום ראים, lit. “in the place of those seeing,” Syr. probably rd. במ' מוראים “place of fear.” Wr. reads רפאים “shades.”

27. על-כן אשר are variants and very awkward here. Omit probably על-כן with Bi. LXX Syr. appear to have only one connective. Budde, Beer, Duhm om. the verse as a gloss. Cf. 21:14.

28. The verses from 28–33 are probably a later insertion with a particular national reference. Cf. Introduction. LXX, Cod. Vat. (MS 248 H. and P.) omits vv. 28–33 which are supplied from Theo. Syr. Hex. Sah. also om. For omission of other Gk. codices cf. note on v. 25. Bi. omits vv. 28–33. Hoff. reads v. 23 after v. 28. MT אליו = עליו, as MS Ken. 125. MT has צעקה in both line *a* and line *b*. Duhm and Beer rd. for second וצרתה or ושתת.

29. MT י שקט. Rd. with MS Ken. 235 י שקט “be quiet,” as Budde, Beer rd. The Hiph. does not give the meaning required by the passage. MT ירשע, Hit. Del. Stud. rd. ירעש (Isa. 14:16). MT ישורני “behold him.” Probably it is better to rd. with Budde for parallelism ירשני “reprove him.” The MT text appears a natural but meaningless conjecture (cf. 40:1). Wr. reads ירשני “release him” (cf. 11:13; Est. 7:3). Duhm reads v. 29c with v. 30 and for יחד of MT יקר or יקר (cf. 8:6). יפקד is proposed in Kit. ed. Budde omits v. 29c as a gloss. Stud. and Hoff. rd. vv. 29f. as the objection of an opponent.

30. Vv. 30–33 appear very corrupt. It is difficult to be sure what the exact form of the text may have been. MT מכלל. Rd. with Theo. Tar. Vul. מכלל, as do Wr. Hoff. Budde. The MT gives an almost impossible reading and construction. Apparently it is a special case here of God's “hiding his face.” Budde suggests משל before v. 30b. MT אדם חנה is omitted by Duhm as a gloss. MT מכלל “snares,” gives no sense here. Beer

31. Let him say unto God, "I endure—
I will not again commit sin.
32. If I have sinned, do thou show me,
If I have wrought evil, it shall be no more."
33. (Shall his requital be as thine?
For thou hast rejected it.
Thou shalt choose, not I,
And what thou knowest, speak.)
35:15. And now, since he visiteth not his anger,
Nor greatly regardeth transgression,—

suggests מַעֲקֹשׁ. Wright מקצרת "from the lowest of the people." Rd. probably with Vul. (*propter peccata*) (Theo. ἀπὸ δυσκολίας, Syr. רַחֲטָא) מַעֲשֵׂי עַם. The reading has some support and gives an understandable sense to the passage.

31. MT הֲאֵמַר. The interrogative ה is not in place in the middle of a line. Rd. probably הֲאֵמַר, Inf. Absolute Niph. = Imper., which gives the most natural sense here. Bi.¹ rd. לִהֲאֵמַר, Theo. הֲאֵמַר; so Duhm, Beer rd. כִּי אֵל אֱלֹהֵי אֲמַר נִשְׁאַתִּי לֹא אֶבֹל עַד בִּל אַחֲזָה. Ley reads vv. 31, 32 כִּי אֵל אֱלֹהֵי אֲמַר נִשְׁאַתִּי לֹא אֶבֹל עַד בִּל אַחֲזָה. Beer suggests אֵל אֱלֹהֵי אֲמַר. MT נִשְׁאַתִּי. Duhm reads נִשְׁאַתִּי (cf. II Kings 14:10) "Ich habe mich überhoben." Beer suggests הִתְנַשְׁאַתִּי. Ley compares use of word Lev. 5:1, 17; Num. 5:31; 9:13; 14:34. Insert עַד at the end of the verse from בִּלְעָדִי in v. 32 and destroy בִּל as dittograph. Beer, Duhm rd. this. LXX MS A, 23 rd. בִּלְעָדִי with v. 31. Sieg. omits v. 31 as corrupt.

32. MT בִּלְעָדִי אַחֲזָה, lit. "beyond what I see," gives no suitable sense here and the usage is very peculiar. Treat the phrase as suggested above. Rd. probably also (with Vul.) אֵם הִטַּאתִי for parallelism. The Syr. in v. 31c (= v. 32a of Heb. text) reads apparently דִּלָּא הִטַּאתִי. Beer suggests the reading of the Vul. עָקַל. Cf. note on 34:10.

33. V. 33 appears quite hopelessly unintelligible in its present form and no really satisfactory suggestion has been made. The first half of the verse is very irregular. MT יִשְׁלֹמֶנָה. Possibly rd. with Budde, Duhm יִשְׁלֹמֶנָה. Sieg. reads שְׁלֹמִים. MT מֵאֲסַת. Duhm reads מֵאֲסַת אֶתָּה "Dass er verwürfe sein Begehren." Bi.¹ supplied אֵל דִּרְכִּי אֵל after מֵאֲסַת. MT לֹא אֲנִי. Ley אֵל "Denn du verwirfst, du wählst, aber nicht Gott!" MT תִּבְחָר, Syr. apparently reads in the Aram. sense "thou art tested." Possibly this should be read in Niph.

15. Vv. 15 and 16 of chap. 35 should be read before 34:34. They are evidently not in place where they are as the introductory וַעֲתָה and their connection with 36:2 show. They are related in style and thought to chap. 34 and may be read very naturally before the section 34:34-37, from which position they were probably forced out before the present insertion 34:28-33. Later a place was found for them in chap. 35, just before Elihu's last speech. 2 LXX MSS, Syr. Hex., Sah. omit the verses which are supplied from Theo. (cf. Introduction). Duhm, Beer transpose v. 16 after 35:8 and connect v. 15 with 36:2. Bi. Hatch omit vv. 15, 16. Ley supplies הָאֲמַר in thought after

16. Job openeth his mouth with vanity,
And multiplieth words without knowledge.
34. Men of understanding will say unto me,
Yea, and the Wise Man who heareth;
35. "Job hath spoken without knowledge
And his words are not with understanding."
36. But, verily, Job is tried unto the utmost,
For his answering as men of evil.
37. He addeth transgression unto sin;
He clappeth his hands among us,
And multiplieth his words against God.

רעתה for understanding of the passage. MT אֵין פֶּקֶד, rd. with Theo. Sym. אֵין פֶּקֶד, as do Hit. Budde, Sieg. Beer. MT בִּפְשׁ. The word פֶּשׁ "folly" is found only here. Rd. with Theo. Sym. Vul. בִּפְשֵׁעַ—Reuss, Stud. G. Hoff. Dill. Baeth. Duhm, Beer.

16. MT יִקְבֵּר. The Hiph. "multiply" is found only here and 34:37; also 36:31 with the force of a substantive. 20 MSS Ken. Theo. Sym. rd. יִקְבִּיר "make heavy."

34. Vv. 15, 16 of chap. 35, having stated the speaker's verdict on Job's words, vv. 34, 35 bring the appeal to the judgment of the Wise Men, parallel to that in vv. 2-4.

35. דַּעַת is used here as 10:7; 13:2; 15:2; 33:3; 35:16; 36:12. Elsewhere in Elihu דַּעַי is found 32:6; 36:3; 37:16. הִשְׁכִּיל, Inf. Absolute (cf. Jer. 3:15), Ols. הִשְׁכִּיל.

36. MT אֲבִי is an unusual particle of wishing. Rd. rather with LXX, Sah. Aeth. אֵילִם, as do Sieg. Bi. Hitz. אֵבִל, Hoff. אֲבִי (Prov. 23:29), Budde (cf. 32:8). Rd. יִבְחֶן as a simple Impf. It is usually read as a wish, but the particle is not good support for this reading and a wish is rather out of place here. Bi. reads יִבְחֶר and omits עַד "Möcht er doch Einfalt wählen!" Duhm proposes יִזְהַר (LXX μάθε), "Ach liesse sich doch Hiob warnen!" MT בִּאֲשֵׁי. Rd. with MSS Ken. 89, 95, LXX כִּאֲשֵׁי. Beer suggests this reading. The sense is improved by it.

37. שֹׁפֵק = יִסְפֵּק 27:23 in meaning. The word means literally "strike," "smite," but here one must supply, at least in thought, כַּפָּי "hands." The expression is symbolic of mocking. Ley omits v. 37b which is too short as it stands; Bi. Duhm om. also, including פֶּשַׁע of v. 37a. MT יִרָב is a poetically shortened form for יִרְבֶּה.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

LITERATURE ON JOB

- Augustine, *Annotatum in Iob*. "Patrologiae Cursus Completus," Vol. 34, c. 825 f. Paris, 1845.
- Baethgen, F., "Hiob" in Kautzsch, *Die heilige Schrift des A.T.* Leipzig, 1894.

- Baur, Gustav, "Das Buch Hiob und Dante's Divina Commoedia." *Theol. Studien und Kritiken* (1856), p. 583.
- Beer, G., "Proverbia et Iob" in Kittel's *Biblica Hebraica*. Leipzig, 1906.
- Bickell, G., "Krit. Bearbeitung des Jobdialogs," *Wiener Zeitschrift f. d. Kunde d. Morgenlandes* (1892), S. 137 f., 241 f., 327 f. (1893), S. 1 f., 153 f.
- , *Das Buch Job*. Wien, 1894.
- Bleek, F., *Einleitung ins A.T.* 6. Aufl. von Wellhausen. Berlin, 1893.
- Boelicke, M., *Die Elihureden* (Dissertation). Halle, 1879.
- Bradley, G., *Lectures on the Book of Job*. Oxford, 1887.
- Budde, K., *Beiträge zur Kritik des Buches Hiob*. Bonn, 1876.
- , "Das Buch Hiob," in Nowack's *Handkommentar zum A.T.* Göttingen, 1896.
- Calvin, John, *Conciones*. 1563 (translated by A. Golding, 1593).
- Cheyne, T. K., *Job and Solomon*. London, 1887.
- , "The Book of Job and Its Latest Commentator," in *The Expositor* (1897; fifth series), V, 401 f.; VI, 22 f.
- Cornill, C., *Introduction to the Canonical Books of the O.T.* (English transl. by Box). London, 1907.
- Cox, S. A., *A Commentary on the Book of Job*. London, 1885.
- Davison, W. T., Art. "Job" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, II (1899).
- Davidson, A. B., "The Book of Job" in the *Cambridge Bible*. Cambridge and London, 1884.
- Delitzsch, Franz, *Das Buch Hiob*. Leipzig, 1876.
- Delitzsch, Friedrich, *Das Buch Hiob*. Leipzig, 1902.
- Deutsch, I., *De Elihui sermonum origine atque auctore* (Dissertation). Breslau, 1873.
- Dillmann, A., *Hiob*. Leipzig, 1869; 4th ed., 1891.
- , "Textkritisches zum Buche Hiob," in *Sitzungsberichte der kgl. Akademie zu Berlin* (1890), II, S. 1345.
- Driver, S. R., *Introduction to the Literature of the O.T.* Edinburgh, New York, 1891.
- , "The Sceptics of the O.T.," *Contemporary Review*, LXIX (1896), 257 f.
- Duhm, B., "Das Buch Hiob," in Marti's *Handkommentar zum A.T.* Tübingen, 1897.
- Eichhorn, J. G., *Einleitung ins A.T.*, III. Leipzig, 1803.
- Ewald, H., *Die poetischen Bücher des A.T.*, III. Göttingen, 1836.
- Galliner, J., *Abraham Ibn Esra's Hiobkommentar* (Dissertation). Berlin, 1901.
- Genung, J. F., *The Epic of the Inner Life*. Boston and New York, 1891.
- Gilbert, G. H., *The Poetry of Job*. Chicago, 1889.
- Godet, F., *Études bibliques*. Paris, 1873.
- Graetz, H., "Das Zeitalter d. griechischen Uebersetzung d. B. Hiob," *Monatsschrift*, XXVI (1877), 83 f.
- Green, W. H., *The Argument of the Book of Job Unfolded*. New York, 1874.

- Gregory, "Expositio moralis in beatum Iob," *Bibliotheca Patrum Latina*, 75, 76.
- Grill, J., *Zur Kritik der Komposition d. B. Hiob*. Tübingen, 1890.
- Hahn, H. A., *Kommentar über das Buch Hiob*. Berlin, 1850. .
- Hatch, E., "On Origen's Revision of the LXX Text of Job," in *Essays on Biblical Greek*. Oxford, 1889.
- Heiligstedt, *Commentarius in Jobum*. Leipzig, 1842.
- Hengstenberg, E. W., *Das Buch Hiob*. Berlin, 1870.
- Herder, J. G., *Vom Geist der Ebräischen Poesie*, I. Dessau, 1782.
- Hirzel, L., *Hiob* (2 ed., by Olshausen). Leipzig, 1852.
- Hitzig, F., *Das Buch Hiob*. Leipzig, 1874.
- Hodges, *Elihu, or an Enquiry into the Principal Scope and Design of the Book of Job*. London, 1750.
- Hoffmann, J. G., *Hiob*. Kiel, 1891.
- Holtzmann, H., in *Stade's Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, II. Berlin, 1888.
- Jastrow, M., "A Babylonian Parallel to the Story of Job," *Journal of Bib. Lit.* (1905), XXV, 135-91.
- Jerome, *Praefatio in Job*, IX.
- Kleinert, P., "Das spezifisch Hebräische im Buche Hiob," *Theol. Studien und Kritiken* (1886), 26 f.
- Koenig, E., *Einleitung in das A.T.* Bonn, 1893.
- , "The Problem of the Book of Job," *American Journal of Theol.* (1904), VIII, 66 f.
- Kuenen, A., *Historisch-kritische Einleitung*, III (German transl. by Müller). Leipzig, 1894.
- Laue, J. L., *Die Komposition d. B. Hiob* (Dissertation). Halle, 1895.
- Ley, J., *Das Buch Hiob*. Halle, 1903.
- , "Die Abfassungszeit d. B. Hiob," *Theol. Studien und Kritiken* (1898) 34 f.
- , "Charakteristik der drei Freunde Hiobs," *Theol. Studien und Kritiken* (1900), 331 f.
- , "Das Problem in B. Hiob," *Neue Jahrbücher für Phil. u. Pädag.* (1896), II, 125.
- Lowth, R., *De sacra poesi Hebraeorum* (edited by Rosenmueller). Leipzig, 1815.
- Macdonald, D. B., "Some External Evidence on the Original Form of the Legend of Job," *American Journal of Sem. Languages* (1897), XIV, 137 f.
- Magnus, E., *Commentar zum Hiob*. Halle, 1851.
- Mandl, A., *Die Peschittha zu Hiob*. 1892.
- Margoliouth, D. H., Art. "Job" in *Smith's Bible Dic.* (2d ed. 1893).
- Marti, K., *Geschichte der israelitischen Religion* (1897), III, 262 f.
- Meinhold, J., "Das Problem d. B. Hiob," *Neue Jahrbücher f. deutsche Theol.* (1892), 63 f.

- Merx, A., *Das Gedicht von Hiob*. Jena, 1871.
 Michaelis, J. H., *Notae uberiores in librum Jobi*. Halle, 1720.
 Nöldeke, Th., *Göttinger Gelehrte Anzeigen* (1865), S. 575 f.
 Peake, A. S., "Job" in the *Century Bible*. Edinburgh, 1905.
 Posselt, Wenzel, *Der Verfasser der Eliu-Reden*. Freiburg im Breisgau, 1909.
 Renan, E., *Le livre de Job*. Paris, 1865.
 Reuss, E., *Hiob*. Braunschweig, 1888.
 ———, *Geschichte der heiligen Schrift d. A.T.* Braunschweig, 1881.
 Rosenmueller, E., *Scholia in Vetus Testamentum*, V. Leipzig, 1824.
 Schlottmann, H., *Das Buch Hiob*.
 Schrader, E. (De Wette-Schrader). *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung*. Berlin, 1869.
 Schultens, A., *Liber Jobi*. Leyden, 1737.
 Siegfried, C., "The Book of Job" in *Sacred Books of the O.T.* Baltimore, 1893.
 ———, Art. "Job" in *Jew. Enc.*
 Stickel, J. G., *Das Buch Hiob*. Leipzig, 1842.
 Strack, H., *Einleitung ins A.T.* München, 1895.
 Studer, L., *Das Buch Hiob*. Heidelberg, 1832.
 Stuhlmann, M., *Hiob*. Hamburg, 1804.
 Umbreit, F. W. C., *Das Buch Hiob*. Heidelberg, 1832.
 Vatke, W., *Biblische Theologie*, I. Berlin, 1835.
 Watson, R. A., "The Book of Job" in the *Expositor's Bible*. New York, 1892.
 Wellhausen, J., *Jahrbücher f. deutsche Theol.* (1871), XVI, 552.
 Wildeboer, G., *Die Literatur des A.T.* (German transl. by Risch, 1895).
 Wright, G. H. B., *The Book of Job*. London, 1883.

GENERAL LITERATURE

- Bacher, W., Art. "Targum" in *Jew. Enc.*
 Barton, G. A., "Ecclesiastes," *International Critical Commentary*. Edinburgh and New York, 1908.
 Burkitt, F. C., *The Old Latin and The Itala*. Cambridge, 1896.
 Cheyne, T. K., *Jewish Religious Life after the Exile*. New York, 1898.
 Friedländer, M., *Griechische Philosophie im A.T.* Berlin, 1894.
 Gunkel, H., *Schöpfung und Chaos*. Göttingen, 1895.
 ———, *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des N.T.* Göttingen, 1903.
 Lévi, *The Hebrew Text of Ecclesiasticus*, "Semitic Study Series." Leyden, 1904.
 Peake, A. S., *The Problem of Suffering in the O.T.* London, 1904.
 Schürer, E., *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes* (3d ed.). Leipzig, 1898.
 Swete, H. B., *An Introduction to the O.T. in Greek*. Cambridge, 1900.
 Toy, C., "Proverbs." *International Critical Commentary*. Edinburgh, 1899.

MATERIAL FOR TEXT CRITICAL APPARATUS

Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum cum Variis Lectionibus. Benjamin Kennicott, Oxford, 1780.

Vetus Testamentum Graecum cum Variis Lectionibus. Holmes and Parsons, Oxford, 1823.

The Old Testament in Greek, II. H. B. Swete, Cambridge, 1887.

Origenis Hexaplorum Quae Supersunt, II. Field, Oxford, 1875.

Walton's Polyglott. London, 1656.

Sacrorum Bibliorum Fragmenta Copto-Sahidica, II. Rome, 1889.

For the readings of the Sahidic text I am indebted to Professor George A. Barton, who kindly placed his collation of the text at my disposal.

Facsimile of Codex Alexandrinus. Published by the British Museum, 1883.

REFERENCE BOOKS

A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Brown, Driver, and Briggs, New York, 1906.

A Concordance to the Septuagint. Hatch and Redpath, Oxford, 1897.

Talmudic Dictionary, Jastrow, M., London and New York, 1903.

Lexicon Syriacum. Brockelmann C., Berlin, 1895.

Thesaurus Syriacus. Payne-Smith, R., Oxford, 1879.

ABBREVIATIONS

A.=Version of Aquila.

Aeth.=Aethiopic version

Alex.=Greek Codex Alexandrinus.

Baeth.=Baethgen F., *Hiob* in Kautzsch's *Die heilige Schrift d. A.T.*

B. D. B.=Brown, Driver, and Briggs, *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the O.T.*

Bi.=Bickell, G., *Das Buch Hiob.*

Bodl.=a Latin MS of the Old Latin and the Vulgate in the Bodleian Library (Cod. Lat. 2426).

Col.=a Greek MS of the LXX, Cod. Colbertus, in the Bibliothèque National (1952).

Del.=Delitzsch, Franz, *Das Buch Hiob.*

Dill.=Dillmann, A., *Hiob.*

Enc. Bib.=*Encyclopaedia Biblica.*

Ew.=Ewald, H., "Hiob" in *Die poetischen Bücher des A.T.*, III.

Hit.=Hitzig, F., *Das Buch Hiob.*

Hoff.=Hoffmann, G., *Hiob.*

H. and P.=Holmes and Parsons, *Vetus Testamentum Graecum.*

Hz.=Hirzel, L., *Hiob.*

Jew. Enc.=*Jewish Encyclopaedia.*

Ken.=Kennicott, B., *Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum.*

Keth.=Kethib, the Hebrew Text as written.

Kit. Ed.=Kittel's edition of "Job" in *Biblica Hebraica*.

LXX=Greek Septuagint version.

MT=The Massoretic pointed text.

Marm.=A Latin MS found in the monastery of Marmoutiers.

Ols.=Olshausen in 2d ed. of L. Hirzel's *Hiob*.

P.=Priestly document of the Hexateuch, ca. 450.

Qr.=Qere, the Hebrew text as read.

Sah.=Sahidic version.

Sieg.=Siegfried, C., *The Book of Job*.

Stud.=Studer, L., *Das Buch Hiob*.

Sym.=Version of Symmachus.

Syr.=Syriac, Peshitto version.

Syr-Hex.=Syriac Hexapla version.

Tar.=Targum on Job, or Aramaic version.

Theo.=Version of Theodotion.

Vat.=A Greek MS of the LXX in the Vatican (346, numbered by H. and P. 248).

Vet. Lat.=Old Latin version.

Vul.=Vulgate version.

Wr.=Wright, G. H. B., *The Book of Job*.